

The Second PART
OF THE
PRESERVATIVE
AGAINST
POPERY:

Shewing how
Contrary P O P E R Y is to the True Ends
OF THE
Christian Religion.

Fitted for the
Instruction of Unlearned Protestants.

By WILLIAM SHERLOCK, D. D.
Master of the TEMPLE.

The Third Edition.

Imprimatur.

May 3. 1688. *Guil. Needham, R.R. in Christo P. ac D. D.*
Wilhelmo Archiepis. Cant. à Sacr. Domest.

LONDON: Printed for **W. Rogers**, at the *Sun* over against
St. Dunstan's Church in *Fleet-street*. MDCXCI.

THE
Preservative
AGAINST
P O P E R Y.

CHAP. IV.

Some Directions relating to particular Controversies.

THose who would understand the particular Disputes between Us and the Church of *Rome*, must of necessity read such Books as give the true State of the Controversie between Us, and fairly represent the Arguments on both sides; and where such Books are to be met with, he may learn from a late Letter, Entitled, *The Present State of the Controversie between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, Or an Account of Books written on both sides.* But my present Design is of another nature, to give some plain and easie Marks and Characters of true Gospel Doctrines; whereby a Man, who has any relish of the true Spirit of Christianity, may as certainly know Truth from Error in many cases, as the Palate can distinguish Taits. There are some things so proper to the Gospel, and so primarily intended in it, that they may fully serve for distinguishing Marks of true Evangelical Doctrine: I shall name some of the chief, and Examine some Popish Doctrines by them.

SECTION I.

Concerning IDOLATRY.

1. **O**NE principal intention of the Gospel, was more perfectly to extirpate all Idolatry ; *For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, to destroy the works of the devil :* that is, not only all Sin and Wickedness, but the very Kingdom of Darknes ; that Kingdom the Devil had erected in the World, the very Foundation of which was laid in Idolatrous Worship.

To this purpose Christ has expressly taught us, that there is but One God, and has perfectly instructed us in the Nature of God : *For no man hath seen God at any time, but the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.* Ignorance was the Mother of Pagan Idolatry, because they did not know the true God, they worshipped any thing, every thing, for a God ; and therefore the most effectual course to cure Idolatry, was to make known the true God to the World : for those Men are inexcusable who know the true God, and worship any thing else. Tho' indeed according to some Mens Divinity, the knowledge of the true God cures Idolatry, not by rooting out Idolatrous Worship, but by excusing it ; by making that to be no Idolatry in a Christian, who knows God, which was Idolatry in a Heathen, who did not know him : for if (as some say) none can be guilty of Idolatry, who acknowledge One Supreme Being ; then the Heathens, when once they were instructed in the knowledge of the One true God, might have worshipped all their Country Gods, which they did before, without being guilty of Idolatry ; which is, as if I should say, that Man is a Rebel, who through mistake and ignorance owns any Man for his Prince, who is not his Prince ; but he is no Rebel, who knows his lawful Prince, and pays Homage to another, whom he knows not to be his Prince.

And therefore our Saviour confines all Religious Worship to God alone : *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve :* It is his Answer to the Devil, when he tempted him to fall down and worship him ; but he gives such an Answer as excludes all Creatures, not only bad, but good Spirits, from any share in Religious Worship : Our Saviour does not deny to worship him meely because he was the Devil, (tho' that a Man may do without the guilt of Idolatry, who knows him to be the Devil, if those Men are in the right, who allow nothing to be Idolatry, but to worship some Being for the Supreme God, who is not Supreme ; for then you may worship the Devil without the guilt of Idolatry, if you do not believe him to be the Supreme God) but our

our Saviour's reason for not worshipping him was, because we must worship none but God. Which is as good a reason against the Worship of the most glorious Angel, as of the devil himself: Nay, our Saviour denies to worship him though the Devil made no terms with him, about the kind or degrees of Worship: He does not require him to offer Sacrifice to him, (which is the only Act of Worship the Church of *Rome* appropriates to the Supreme God) but only to bow down before him, as an expression of Religious Devotion; he did not demand that degree of Worship, which the Church of *Rome* calls *Latria*, and appropriates to the Supreme God; nay, he confesses that he was not the Supreme God, for he does not pretend to dispose of the Kingdoms of the World in his own right, but says, they were given to him, and he had power to give them to whom he pleased; in which he acknowledges, that he had a Superiour, and therefore could not in the same breath desire to be owned and worshipped as the Supreme. But our Saviour denies to give him this inferiour degree of Worship, and thereby teaches us, that no degree of Religious Worship must be given to any Being, but the Supreme God.

And because Mankind were very apt to worship inferiour Dæmons, as believing them to have the care of this lower World, and that it was in their power to do great good to them, to answer their Prayers, and to mediate for them with the Superiour Deities, or with the Supreme God, if they believed one Supreme, which appears to be a received Notion among them: to prevent this kind of Idolatry, God advances his own Son to be the universal Mediator, and the Supreme and Sovereign Lord of the World; that all Mankind should make their Addresses and Applications to him, and offer up their Prayers only in his Name; that in Him they should find acceptance, and in no other Name. Which was the most effectual way to put an end to the Worship of all inferiour Deities, and Creature-Patrons and Advocates; for when we are assured, that no other Being can mediate for us with effect and power, but only Christ, it is natural to worship no other Mediator but him, who being the eternal Son of God, may be worshipped without danger of Idolatry. Thus St. Paul tells us, That tho' the Heathen World had Gods many, and Lords many; yet to us there is ^{1 Cor. 8.} but One God the Father, and One Lord Jesus Christ: One Supreme and ^{5. 6.} Sovereign Deity, and one Mediator between God and Men.

Now this being so apparently one end of Christ's coming into the World to suppress the Idolatry of Creature-Worship, and to confine all Religious Worship to one Supreme Being, in opposition to the many Gods of the Heathens, and to teach us to make our Applications to this One God by One Mediator, in opposition to the worship of inferiour Deities; can any Man imagine, that the worship of Saints
and

and Angels, and the Virgin *Mary*, can be any part of the Christian Religion? For how dear soever they are to God, they are but his Creatures, and if Sovereign Princes will not receive their greatest Favourites into their Throne, much less will God.

If God under the Gospel dispensation has taken care to prevent the Worship of inferiour Beings, by appointing his own Son to be our only Mediator and Advocate, can we imagine, that he ever intended we should offer up our Prayers to other Mediators? If he had liked the Mediation of Creatures, would he have given his own Son to be our Priest and our Mediator? Whatever fair pretences may be made for this, it apparently contradicts the Gospel-dispensation; for if we must own but one God, he alone must be worshipped; if we have but one Mediator, we must offer up our Prayers only in his Name and Intercession. The Religious Worship of Creatures is Idolatry, and if God intended to root Idolatry out of the World, by the Gospel of Christ, he could never intend to set up the Worship of Saints, and the Virgin *Mary*, which tho' it have not all the aggravations of Pagan Idolatry, yet is Creature-worship.

Thus we know, how fond the Heathens were of material Images and Pictures, to represent their Gods as visibly present with them; and to receive Religious Worship in their stead: not that they did believe their Gods to be Corporeal, or that their Corporeal Images were proper Likenesses of their Gods, in which a late Author places the whole of Idolatry, which I confess was agreeable enough to his design, to find out such a Notion of Idolatry, as it may be no Persons in the World were ever guilty of, and then he might excuse, whom he pleased from Idolatry: But the Heathens were not such great Sots,

Dr. Stillin. as this account makes them, as the Learned Founder of all *Anti Catholick*, Defence of and *Anti-Christian Principles* (as this Author is pleased to stile a very the Dis- great Man, whose Name will be Venerable to future Ages) has abun- coursecon- dantly proved. But they wanted some material Representations of dolatry. their Gods, in which they might as it were see them present, and offer up their Petitions to them, and court them with some visible and sensible Honours. Now to cure this Idolatry, tho' God would not allow any Images or Pictures for Worship, yet by the Law of *Moses* he appoints them to build an House or Temple for himself, where he would dwell among them, and place the Symbols of his Presence; 25 Exod. there was the Mercy-seat, and the Cherubims covering the 22. Mercy-seat, and there God promised *Moses* to meet with him, and to commune with him from between the two Cherubims, which are upon the ark of the testimony. Now this was a Symbolical Representation of God's Throne in Heaven, where he is surrounded with Angels,

gels, as we know, the Holy of Holies itself was a Figure of Heaven ; and therefore the *Jews*, when they were absent from the Temple, prayed towards it, and in the Temple (as is thought) towards the Mercy-seat, as the place of God's peculiar Residence ; as now when we pray, we lift up our eyes and hands to Heaven, where God dwells : So that under the Law God had a peculiar Place for Worship, and peculiar Symbols of his Presence, but no Images to represent his Person, or to be the Objects of Worship : I know some *Roman* Doctors would fain prove the Cherubims to have been the Objects of Worship ; and which is more wonderful, a late Bishop of the Church of *England* has taken some pains to prove the same, and thereby to justify the Worship of Images in the Church of *Rome* ; and before I proceed, I shall briefly Examine what he has said in this Cause.

Reasons
for Abro-
gating the
Test, p.
124, &c.

One would a little wonder, who reads the Second Commandment, which so severely forbids the Worship of Images, that God himself should set up Images in his own Temple as the Objects of Worship ; and a modest Man would have been a little cautious, how he had imputed such a thing to God, which is so direct a Contradiction to his own Laws. That the Cherubims were *Statues or Images, whatever their particular Form was*, I agree with our Author, and that is the only thing I agree with him in : For, .

I. That *they were Sacred Images set up by God himself, in the place of his own Worship*, I deny. For the Holy of Holies, where the Ark was placed, and the Mercy-seat over the Ark, and the Cherubims at the two ends spreading their Wings, and covering the Mercy-seat, was not the place of Worship, but the place of God's Presence. The place of Worship is the place wherein Men worship God ; now it is sufficiently known, that none of the *Jews* were permitted to go into the Holy of Holies, nor so much as to look into it, and therefore it could not be the place of their Worship : the Holy of Holies was the Figure of Heaven, and therefore could be no more the place of Worship to the *Jews*, than Heaven now is to us, while we dwell on Earth. The High-Priest indeed entered into the Holy of Holies once a Year, with the Blood of the Sacrifice, which was a Type of Christ's entering into Heaven with his own Blood, and yet the Priest went thither not to Worship, but to make an Atonement ; which I take to be two very different things : however, if you will call this Worship, it has no relation to any Worship on Earth, but to what is done by Christ in Heaven, of whom the High-Priest was a Type. And this, I think, is a demonstration, that the placing of Cherubims to cover the Mercy-seat in the Holy of Holies, does not prove the lawful Use of Images.

9 *Heb.* 11,
12.

images

images in Temples or Churches, or in the Worship of God on Earth; if it proves any thing, it must prove the Worship of God by Images in Heaven, of which the Holy of Holies was a Figure; and if any Man can be so foolish as to imagine that, let them make what they please of it, so they do but excuse us from worshipping God by Images on Earth.

2. That these Cherubims were the most solemn and sacred part of the Jewish Religion; that nothing is more remarkable in all the Old Testament, than the honour done to the Cherubims, that an outward worship was given to these Images, as Symbols of the Divine Presence, that the High Priest adored these Cherubims once a Year, as this Author asserts, I utterly deny; and he has not given us one word to prove it.

For the Cherubims were so far from being the most solemn and sacred part of the Jewish Religion, that they were no part at all of it, if by Religion he means Worship; for there was no regard at all had to the Cherubims in the Jewish Worship; and it is so far from being remarkable in the Old Testament, that there is not the least footstep or intimation of any honour at all done to the Cherubims: There is nothing in Scripture concerning them, but the command to make them, and place them at the two ends of the Mercy-Seat; and that God is said to dwell between the Cherubims, and to give forth his Oracles and Responses from that place: but I desire to learn, where the Jews are commanded to direct their Worship to or towards the Cherubims? where the High Priest is commanded to adore the Cherubims once a Year? or what Protestant grants he did so, as this Author insinuates?

He supposes the Cherubims to have been the Symbols of God's Presence, and his Representations, and that the Jews directed their Worship to them as such, and that is to worship God by Images, or to give the same signs of Reverence to his Representations, as to Himself: but how does it appear, that the Cherubims were the Symbol's of God's Presence? God indeed is said to sit between the Cherubims, and he promised Moses to commune with him from between the Cherubims, but the Cherubims were no Symbols of God's Presence, much less a Representation of him: if any thing was the Symbolical Presence of God, it was the Mercy-Seat, which was a kind of Figurative Throne, or Chair of State; but the Cherubims were only Symbolical Representations of those Angels who attend and encompass God's Throne in Heaven, and were no more Representations of God, or Symbols of his Presence, then some great Ministers of State are of the King; as this Author himself acknowledges, when he makes the four Beasts in the

the Revelation (Rev. 4. 6, 7.) which stood round about the Throne, to be Page 127.
an allusion to the representation of the immediate Divine Presence in the Ark
by the Cherubims; if he had said to the Cherubims covering the Mer-
cy-Seat, which was his Figurative Throne, and where he was invisibly
present, without any visible Figures or Symbols of his Presence, he
had said right: for the Cherubims which covered the Mercy-Seat,
were no more Symbols of God's Presence, than the four Beasts, which
stood before the Throne, are the Presence of God; or then some
great Courtiers or Ministers of State, who attend the King, are the
Presence of the King; they attend the King, where-ever he is, and
so may be some sign of his Presence, but are not a symbolical Pre-
sence, as a Chair of State is. But it seems our Author imagined, that
the Cherubims were such Symbols of God's Presence, and such Re-
presentations of him, as Images were of the Pagan Gods, and therefore
might be worshipped with the same signs of Reverence, as God him-
self was; according to *Thomas Aquinas's* Rule, that the Image must
be worshipped with the same Worship, which is due to the Proto-
type, or that Being whose Image it is, which is such Old Popery, as
Monseigneur De Meaux, and the Representer cry shame of; well, But
how does he prove, that any Worship was directed to these Cheru-
bims? I can find no Proof he offers for it, but *David's Exhortation* (as Page 130.
he calls it) to the People, to honour the Ark (he should have said wor-
ship) *prostrare, bow down to, or worship his Footstool, for it, or he, is ho-
ly.* Now suppose this did relate to the Ark, What is that to the Che-
rubims? When four Pages before, he tells us, that the Ark is called
God's Footstool, and the Cherubims his Throne; How then does *David's*
Exhortation to worship the Ark, which is God's Footstool, prove that
all their Worship must be directed to the Cherubims, which are his
Throne? It is pitty, that great Wits have but short Memories.

And yet I fancy, our Author would have been much troubled to
prove the Ark to be meant by God's Footstool; for the Ark was in
the Holy of Holies, which was a Figure of Heaven; and neither the
Heaven, nor any thing in it, but the Earth, is in Scripture called God's
Foot-stool; and the *Psalmist* expressly applies it to *Zion*, and to the 99 Psal. 2.
Holy Hill, which, I will not prove, was not the Ark. 9.

And this I suppose is a sufficient Confutation of his Exposition of
the words, *To bow down to, or worship his foot-stool*; for I believe he did
not think that Mount *Zion*, or the Holy Hill, was the Object of Wor-
ship, or the Symbol of God's Presence; but there God was present,
and that was reason enough to worship at his foot-stool, and at his holy
hill; as our English Translation reads it.

B

But

But now suppose the *Jews* were to direct their Worship towards the Mercy-Seat, which was covered with the Cherubims, where God had promised to be present ; how are the Cherubims concerned in this Worship ? The worship was paid only to God, though directed to God, as peculiarly present at that place ; which is no more, than to lift up our Eyes and Hands to Heaven, where the Throne of God is, when we pray to him : I grant, that *bowing to*, and *bowing towards* any thing, as the Object of Worship, is the very same, as this Author observes ; and therefore had the *Jews* either bowed *to* or *towards* the Cherubims, as the Objects of their Worship, as the Papists bow *to* or *towards* their Images, they had been equally guilty of Idolatry, and the breach of the second Commandment ; but when *bowing to* signifies bowing to an Object of Worship, and *bowing towards* signifies bowing to this Object of Worship, only *towards* such a place, where he is peculiarly present, this makes a great difference ; and this was all the *Jews* did at most, if they did that ; they bowed to God towards the Mercy-seat, where he dwelt, without any regard to the Cherubims or Mercy-seat, as the Object of Worship, which was as invisible to the *Jews* then, as the Throne of God, and the Angels in Heaven are now to us ; and we may as well say, that those who lift up their eyes and their hands to Heaven, when they pray to God, worship the Angels, who incircle his Throne, because they know that the Angels are there ; as say, that the *Jews* worshipped their invisible Cherubims, because they knew that the Cherubims were there : For is there any necessity that the *Jews* must worship whatever they knew, was in the Holy of Holies, because they worshipped God towards that place, any more than there is, that we must worship whatever we know to be in Heaven, when we direct our Worship to God in Heaven ?

Men, I grant, may worship an unseen Object, for so we all worship God, whom we do not and cannot see ; but it is a good Argument still, that the Cherubims were not intended by God for the Objects of Worship, because they were concealed from the Peoples sight ; for I believe the World never heard before of worshipping invisible Images : The original Intention of Images, is to have a visible Object of Worship ; for an invisible Image can affect us no more than an invisible God ; and if our Author had consulted all the Patrons of Image-Worship, whether Pagan or Popish, he would have found most of the Reasons they alledge for this Worship, to depend on Sight, and therefore whatever he thought, are all lost when a Man shuts his eyes. A Man who directs his Worship to an Image, may be an Idolater
in

in the dark, and with his eyes shut ; but as blind as Idolaters are, there never had been any Image-Worship, had their Images been as Invisible as their Gods ; and therefore Sight has more to do in this matter, than our Author was aware of.

But it seems the High-Priest once a Year did see these Cherubims, and adore and worship them. But this is another Mistake : for the *Jews* did believe, that the High-Priest never saw the Cherubims or Mercy-seat, even when he went once a Year into the Holy of Holies ; and they have great reason for what they say, since God expressly commanded, That when he went into the Holy of Holies, he should take a censer full of burning coals of fire from off the altar before the Lord, and his hands full of sweet incense beaten small, and bring it within the veil : And he shall put the incense upon the fire before the Lord, that the cloud of the incense may cover the mercy-seat, that is upon the testimony, that he die not, 16. Levit. 12, 13. which shews that the Cherubims and Mercy-seat were to be covered with a Cloud of Incense, and to become as invisible to the High-Priest within the Veil, as to the People without it.

But suppose the High-Priest did see the Cherubims, when he entered within the Veil, I have one plain Argument to prove that he did not worship them, not only because no Act of Worship was commanded him when he went into the Holy Place, but because as the Holy of Holies was the Figure of Heaven, and the Cherubims the Types of Angels, who stand about the Throne of God ; so the High-Priest entering into the Holy of Holies, was the Type of Christ ascending into Heaven with his own Blood ; and therefore the High-Priest must do nothing in the Holy of Holies, but what was a proper Figure and Type of what Christ does in Heaven : and then he must no more Worship the Cherubims, which covered the Mercy-seat, or the Typical Throne of God, than Christ himself, when he ascended to Heaven, was to Worship the Angels, who stand about the Throne.

So that notwithstanding God's command to make two Cherubims, and to place them at the two ends of the Mercy-seat in the Holy of Holies, all Image-Worship was strictly forbid by the Law of *Moses* ; and God has provided the most effectual Remedy against it by the Incarnation of his Son : Mankind have been always fond of some visible Deity, and because God cannot be seen, they have gratified their Superstition by making some visible Images and Representations of an invisible God : now to take them off from mean corporeal Images and Representations, which are both a dishonour to the Divine Na-

ture, and debase the minds of Men, God has given us a visible Image of Himself, has cloathed his own eternal Son with Humane Nature, who is *the brightness of his Father's glory, and the express image of his person*, 1. Heb. 3. And therefore St. John tells us, *That the word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth*, 1 John 14. And for this reason, when Philip was desirous to see the Father, *Shew us the Father and it sufficeth*; Christ tells him, that the Father is to be seen only in the Son, who is his visible Image and Glory; *Jesus saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not seen me Philip? He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, Shew us the Father?* 14 John 8, 9. This was one end of Christ's Incarnation, that we might have a visible Deity, a God Incarnate to represent the Father to us, who is the living and visible Image of God; and there could not be a more effectual way to make Men despise all dead material Representations of God, than to have God visibly represented to us in our own Nature.

It is true, Christ is not visible to us now on Earth, but he is visible in Heaven, and we know, he is the only visible Image of God, and that is enough to teach us, that we must Make and Adore no other. He is as visible to us in Heaven, as the Mercy-seat in the Holy of Holies was to the Jews, and is that true Propitiatory of which the Mercy-seat was a Type and Figure, 3 Rom. 25. *Him hath God set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood in as much* the Mercy-seat, as that word is used, 9 Heb. 5. He is the natural Image of God, and his Mercy-seat, or Presence and Throne of Grace; he is his visible Image, though he cannot be seen by us, for the Typical Mercy-seat in the Holy of Holies, did pre-figure, that his Residence should be in Heaven, and therefore invisible to us on Earth, but there we may see him by Faith, and there he will receive our Prayers, and present them to his Father.

Now then to sum up this Argument: Since it was one main design of Christ's appearance, to root all the Remains of Idolatrous Worship out of the World, it is credible, that the *Worship of Saints and Angels*, and the *Virgin Mary*; the *Worship of Images and Reliques*, as it is practised in the Church of *Rome*, should be any part of Christian Worship, or allowed by the Gospel of our Saviour? If Creature-worship, and Image-worship were so offensive to God, here is the Worship of Creatures, and Images still, and therefore all the visible Idolatry, that ever was practised in the World before: All that they can pretend is, that they have better Notions of the Worship of Saints,

Saints, and Angels, and Images, than the Heathens had: but whether they have or no, will be hard to prove: The Pagan Philosophers made the same Apologies for their Worship of Angels, and Dæmons, and Images, which the Learned Papists now make; and whether Unlearned Papists have not as gross Notions about their Worship of Saints and Images, as the Unlearned Heathens had, is very doubtful, and has been very much suspected by Learned Romanists themselves: But suppose there were some difference upon this account, can we think, that Christ, who came to root out all Idolatrous Worship, intended to set up a new kind of Creature-Worship and Image-Worship in greater pomp and glory than ever, and only to rectify Mens Opinions about it? Suppose the Idolatry of Creature-Worship and Image-Worship, does consist only in Mens gross Notions about it; yet we see under the Law to prevent and cure this, God did not go about to rectify their Opinions of these things, but absolutely forbids the Worship of all Images, and of any other Being but himself, which methinks he would not have done, had there been such great advantages in the Worship of Saints, and Angels, and Images, as the Romanists pretend: and when God in the Law of *Moses* forbid all Creature and Image-Worship, can we think, that Christ who came to make a more perfect Reformation, should only change their Country Gods into Saints and Angels, and the Virgin *Mary*, and give new Names to their Statues and Images? Which whatever he had taught about it, instead of curing Idolatry, had been to set up that same kind of Worship, which the Law of *Moses* absolutely forbid, and condemned as Idolatry.

When God to cure the Idolatrous Worship of inferiour Dæmons, as their Mediators and Advocates with the Supreme God, sent his own Son into the World to be our Mediator, can we think, that he intended after this, that we should worship Angels, and Saints, and the Virgin *Mary*, as our Mediators? When God has given us a visible Image of himself, his Eternal and Incarnate Son, whom we may Worship and Adore, did he still intend, that we should worship material and sensible Images of Wood or Stone? By the Incarnation of his own Son, God did indeed take care to rectify Mens mistakes about Creature-Worship, and to cut off all pretences for it: Those who pleaded that vast distance between God and Men, and how unfit it was, that Sinners should make their immediate approaches to the Supreme God, and therefore worshipped inferiour Dæmons as middle Beings between God and Man, have no pretence for this, since God has appointed his own Son to be our Mediator: Those who worshipped

ped

ped Images as the visible Representations of an invisible God, have now a visible Object of Worship, a God Incarnate, a God in the Nature and Likeness of a Man; and though we do not now see him, yet we have the Notion of a visible God and Mediator to whom we can direct our Prayers in Heaven, which is satisfaction enough even to Men of more gross and material Imaginations, without any artificial and senseless Representations of the Deity: And was all this done, that Men might worship Creatures and Images without Idolatry? or rather was it not done to cure Mens inclinations to commit Idolatry with Creatures and Images? Whoever believes that the Gospel of our Saviour was intended as a Remedy against Idolatry, can never be persuaded, that it allows the Worship of Saints and Images; which if it be not Idolatry, is so exactly like it in all external appearance, that the allowance of it does not look like a proper cure for Idolatry.

SECT. II.

Concerning the great Love of GOD to Mankind, and the Assurances of Pardon and Forgiveness which the Gospel gives to all Penitent Sinners; which are much weakened by some Popish Doctrines.

2. **T**He Gospel of Christ was intended to give the highest demonstration of God's Love to Mankind, and the greatest possible Security to all humble penitent Sinners, of the Forgiveness of their Sins: Hence the Gospel is called the *Grace of God*, and the *Gospel of Grace*, as being a Dispensation of Love and Goodness; and therefore whatever lessens and disparages the Gospel-Grace, can be no Gospel-Doctrine. As to consider this particularly:

The Gospel magnifies the Grace of God in giving his own Son for us, *God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life*, 3 John 16. *In this was manifested the love of God towards us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins*, 1 John 4. 9, 10. And St. Paul assures us, that this is such a glorious Manifestation of God's Love, as will not suffer us to doubt of any other expressions of his Goodness: *He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?* 8 Rom. 32. So that the Gospel of our Saviour gives us much higher demonstrations of God's Love and Goodness, than either the Light of Nature, or the Law of Moses did.

Love

Part II. *A Preservative against* POPERY.

13

Love is the prevailing Attribute of God, under the Gospel-dispensation, *For God is love, and he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him,* 1 John 4. 16.

Thus the Gospel of Christ gives a humble Penitent as great assurance of Pardon, as his own guilty Fears can desire; for Repentance and Remission of Sins is preached in the Name of Christ: He has expiated our Sins by the Sacrifice of his Death, *God commendeth his love towards us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us, much more then being justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him; for if when we were enemies we were reconciled unto God by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled we shall be saved by his life,* 5 Rom. 8, 9, 10. For as he was delivered for our Offences, so he was raised again for our Justification; And him hath God exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour to give repentance unto Israel, and remission of sins: So that if any ¹ John 2. man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, *Jesus Christ the righteous,* ^{1, 2.} who is able to save all them to the uttermost, that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them, 7 Heb. 25. These are the fundamental Doctrines of Christianity, and therefore nothing can be a Gospel-Doctrine, which weakens or overthrows them. Let us then examine the Popish Doctrine of Purgatory, and the Invocation of Saints and Angels as our Mediators with God, and see how they are reconcilable with the Gospel-notion of God's love, and that Security it gives us of Pardon through the Merits and Intercession of Christ:

I. Let us consider the Doctrine of Purgatory, which is but the outward Court or Region of Hell, where the Punishments are as severe as in Hell itself, only of a less continuance; and yet as short as they are, they may last many hundred, nay thousand Years, unless their Friends and the Priests be more merciful to them, or they themselves have taken care before Death to pay the Price of their Redemption. This is a barbarous Doctrine, and so inconsistent with that mighty Love of God to penitent Sinners, as it is represented in the Gospel of Christ, that it is not reconcilable with any Notion of Love and Goodness at all; you may call it Justice, you may call it Vengeance, if you please, but Love it is not, or if it be, it is such a Love as no Man can distinguish from Hatred: for my part I declare, I do not desire to be thus loved; I should rather chuse to fall into Nothing, when I die, than to endure a thousand Years torments to be happy for ever; for Humane Nature cannot bear the Thoughts of that: And is this, that wonderful Love of God to Sinners, which is so magnified in the Gospel, to torment those, who are Redeemed by the Blood of Christ, some

some hundred or thousand Years in the Fire of Purgatory, which is not cooler than the Fire of Hell?

The Light of Nature, I confess, never taught this, for Mankind never had any Notion of such an outrageous Love; they always thought, that the Love of God consisted in doing good, not in damning those, whom he loves, for so many Ages: And if this be all the Discovery, the Gospel has made of the Love of God, we have no great reason to glory in it. He who can believe, that God, who so loved the World, as to give his only begotten Son for the Redemption of Sinners, will torment a penitent Sinner so many Years in Purgatory, till he has either endured the punishment of his Sins himself, or is released by the Charity of his Friends, or the Masses of some Mercenary Priests, deserves to lie in Purgatory, till he thinks more honourably of the Divine Goodness, and be convinced, that it is no such extravagant commendation of the Love of God, to send penitent Sinners to Purgatory.

There are two extravagant Notions whereon the Doctrine of Purgatory is founded, which overthrow all the natural Notions Men have of Goodness, and destroy all the hope and confidence of the most penitent Sinners in the Goodness of God. As,

i. That God may forgive Sins, and yet punish us for them; for no Man can go into Purgatory according to the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, whose Sins are not already forgiven: but though his Sins are forgiven, he must make satisfaction for that temporal Punishment which is due to them, either in this World, or in Purgatory: Now how reconcilable these two are, to forgive, and to punish, let all Mankind judge. I believe, very few Men think, they are forgiven, when they are punished; for that which all Men desire should be forgiven them, is the punishment, they have deserv'd. What is it, Men are afraid of, when they have sinned? is it not, that they shall be punished for it? What is it Men desire, when they desire Pardon? is it not, that they may not be punished? And is it any comfort to a Malefactor to be pardoned, and to be hanged? Does any Man boast of his love and kindness, or take any comfort in it, who freely forgives him, but exacts the payment of the Debt, or the punishment of his Fault? And if this be so contrary to the very notion of Goodness and Forgiveness among Men, how comes it to be the notion of Goodness and Forgiveness in God? How comes that to be Love and Goodness, which the Sinner receives no benefit by? for Love and Goodness, I think, signifies to do good; or if this be Goodness, let those take comfort in it that can.

If it be said, that it is an Act of Goodness to exchange the eternal punish-

punishment of Hell, which is due to Sin, into the temporal punishment of Purgatory, I grant, this is something, but only ask, whether it would not have been a more perfect expression of Love and Goodness, to have remitted the temporal Punishment also of, it may be, some thousand Years torment in Purgatory? whether this might not have been expected under a Dispensation of the most perfect Love? and from that God, who sent his only begotten Son into the World to save Sinners? Whether those Sins are perfectly forgiven, which shall be avenged, though not with Eternal, yet with long Temporal Punishments in the next World? Whether any Man thinks himself perfectly forgiven, who is punished very severely, though not absolutely according to his deserts? And consequently, whether the Doctrine of Purgatory be not a very great Diminution of the Love of God, and the Grace of the Gospel? And whether that can be a true Gospel Doctrine; which represents the Love of God, much less than the Love of a kind and good Man, who when he forgives the Injury, forgives the whole Punishment of it? Nay, whether that can be a Gospel Doctrine, which represents the Love of God less than infinite? And I suppose an infinite Love may forgive true Penitents the whole Punishment of their Sins; and then there is no need of Purgatory.

27, In Purgatory, God does not only punish those, whom he has pardoned, but he punishes for no other reason, but Punishment-sake. For thus the *Roman* Doctors tell us, that the Souls in Purgatory, are in a state of Pardon, and in a state of perfect Grace; and they suffer the pains of Purgatory, not to purge away any remains of Sin, or to purify and refine them, and make them more fit for Heaven, but only to bear the punishment due to Sin, for which they had made no satisfaction, while they lived. Now I dare boldly affirm, this is irreconcilable with any degree of Love and Goodness: to make any Punishment just, it must have respect to the guilt of Sin, to make it an act of Goodness, it must be intended for the reformation of the Sinner; but when Sin is pardoned, the guilt at least is taken away, and therefore such punishments can have no relation to guilt; and when the Sinner is in a perfect state of Grace, and needs no amendment, such punishments can have no respect to the good and reformation of the Sinner, and therefore such punishments are neither just nor good, and this is the exact notion of Purgatory; and methinks we should consider, whether this agrees with that account the Gospel gives us of the Love and Goodness of God: should a Prince have a Jayl of the same nature with Purgatory, where for several Years he torments

C

those

those whom he pretends to have pardoned, and who are grown very good Men, and good Subjects, and need no correction, or discipline, I believe all the World would laugh at those, who should call this, Love and Goodness, Pardon and Mercy. Hell is very reconcilable with the Goodness of God, because it is prepared only for those, who are the Objects of a just, a righteous Vengeance, and a very good God may be very just; but Purgatory can never be reconciled with the superabundant goodness of God to Sinners, thro' Jesus Christ, unless Men think it a great kindness to suffer the pains of Hell for several Months, Years, or Ages for no reason, which makes it either just or good to suffer them. So that a Popish Purgatory is inconsistent with the belief of God's great Love and Goodness to Sinners, in Jesus Christ, and destroys the hope and confidence of Sinners: for if they may lie in Purgatory for some thousand Years, as they may do, notwithstanding the Love of God, and the Merits of Christ, if the Pope, or the Priests, or their Money be not more merciful unto them, they have no great reason to glory much in the Goodness of God, though they should go to Heaven at last: so that our Protestant need not dispute much about Purgatory; let him only ask a Popish Priest, How the Doctrine of Purgatory can be reconciled with that stupendious Love of God declared to penitent Sinners, in his Son Jesus Christ? for it is a contradiction to the Notion of Goodness among Men, to inflict such terrible punishments in meer Grace and Love, even when the sin is pardoned, and the Sinner reconciled, and no longer in a state of Discipline and Tryal.

Secondly, The Doctrine of Purgatory destroys, or weakens, that Security the Gospel hath given Sinners of their Redemption from the Wrath of God, and the just punishment of their Sins. One great Security, is the Love of God declared to the World by our Lord Jesus Christ, but if the Love of God to penitent Sinners, who are Redeemed by the Blood of Christ, be consistent with his tormenting them in Purgatory so many thousand Years, as you have already heard, it will be a very hard thing to distinguish such Love from Wrath, and a Sinner, who is afraid of so many thousand Years punishment, can take no great comfort in it: but besides this, the Doctrine of Purgatory destroys Mens hope and confidence in the Merits and Intercession of Christ, and in the express Promises of Pardon and Remission of Sins in his Name.

1. It destroys Mens hopes in the Merits of Christ, and the atonement and expiation of his Blood; For if the Blood of Christ does not deliver

deliver us from the punishment of Sin, what security is this to a Sinner? Yes, you'll say, Christ has Redeemed us from Eternal, though not from Temporal Punishments, and therefore penitent Sinners have this security by the expiation of Christ's Death, that they shall not be eternally Damned: This I know the Church of Rome teaches; but I desire to know, How any Man can be satisfied from Scripture, that Christ by his Death has delivered us from Eternal Punishments, if he have not delivered us from Temporal Punishments of Sin in the next World? I thankfully acknowledge, and it is the only hope I have, that the Gospel has given us abundant assurance of the expiation and atonement made for Sin by the Blood of Christ; but what I say is this, that if these Texts which prove our Redemption by the Death of Christ, do not prove, that Christ has redeemed us from the whole punishment due to Sin in the next World, they prove nothing, and then we have not one place of Scripture to prove, that Christ by his Death has redeemed us from Eternal Punishments; which is enough to make all Christians abhor the Doctrine of Purgatory, if it destroy the Doctrine of Salvation by Jesus Christ. As to shew this briefly:

The hope and security of Sinners depends upon such Scripture expressions as these: That Christ has *died for our sins*, that he has made *atonement* for sin, that he is *a propitiation through faith in his blood*, that he has *redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us*: that *remission and forgiveness of sins is preached in his name*; that *by him we are justified from all those things, from which we could not be justified by the law of Moses*, that *being justified by faith, we have peace with GOD through our Lord Jesus Christ*; that *we are reconciled unto God, and saved from wrath by him*. Now I desire to know, Whether all these Expressions signifie, that for Christ's sake, and through the atonement and expiation of his Blood, a penitent Sinner shall be delivered from the punishment due to his sins? If they do not signifie this, how is a Sinner secured, that though his sins are pardoned, and he is justified, and reconciled to God, and redeemed from the Curse of the Law, and saved from Wrath, he shall not after all this be damned for his sins, since that is the punishment of sin, which it seems is not removed, when the sin is pardoned, and the Sinner justified and reconciled to God? If these Expressions do not signifie taking away the punishment of sin, I desire one Text of Scripture to prove, that a Sinner, who is pardoned and justified, shall not undergo the eternal Punishment of his Sins: If to be pardoned and justified, &c. does signifie to be delivered from the punishment of sin, I desire to know, How a Sinner, who is par-

doned and justified, can be punished for his sins? that is, How a Sinner, who is released from the Punishment of his sins, should be bound to suffer the punishment of his sins in Purgatory?

Our *Roman* Adversaries do indeed distinguish between the Temporal and Eternal Punishment of Sin; the Eternal Punishment of Sin, they say, Christ has made satisfaction for, and that is removed by his Death, that no penitent Sinner shall be eternally Damned; but a Sinner must make satisfaction for the Temporal Punishment of Sin himself, either in this World, or in Purgatory: and consequently that Forgiveness of Sins, signifies the remission of the Eternal Punishment of Sin, but not of the Temporal: now I shall not put them to prove this Distinction from Scripture, which is a very unreasonable Task, because there is nothing in Scripture about it; but yet I would gladly be secured, that I shall be saved from Eternal Punishments; and therefore I would gladly know, how Forgiveness of Sins, and our Redemption from the Curse of the Law, signifies our deliverance from Eternal Punishments, if they do not signify our deliverance from the Punishment of our Sins? And how they can signify our deliverance from the Punishment of our Sins, if notwithstanding this we must suffer the Punishment of our Sins in Purgatory? If they signify, that we shall not be punished for our Sins, then indeed they may signify, that we shall not be eternally punished; but they cannot signify, that we shall not be eternally punished, unless they signify that we shall not be punished, and therefore not in Purgatory neither; if that be the Punishment of Sin. The truth is, this is a very senseless Distinction between the Temporal and Eternal Punishment of Sin: for I desire to know, Whether the Temporal Punishment be not the Punishment of Sin? be not the Curse of the Law? if it be, then Forgiveness of Sin, if it remits the Punishment, remits the Temporal Punishment, for that is the Punishment of Sin; then our Redemption from the Curse of the Law, redeems us from Purgatory, for that is the Curse of the Law too, if you add, and from Death, for that is the Curse of the Law too, and yet those who are redeemed and justified, die still; which shews the Fallacy of this Argument, for it seems Redemption from the Curse of the Law, does not signify our Redemption from the whole Curse, for then a justified Person must not die, since bare dying is part of the Curse. I answer, this had certainly been true, had not the necessity of dying been expressly excepted out of this Redemption; for *in Adam all die*, and it is appointed (by a Divine Decree) for all men once to die, and could they shew, where Purgatory is excepted too, then I would grant, that those who are redeemed from
the

the Curse of the Law might fall into Purgatory, if that be any comfort to them: and yet the case is vastly different between Death and Purgatory; for though Death be the Curse of the Law, yet we may be delivered from Death as a Curse and Punishment, without being delivered from the necessity of dying: and thus good Men are redeemed from Death: for their Sins are expiated and pardoned, and then the String of Death is gone; for *the sting of death is sin*, and therefore when our Sins are pardoned, Death cannot sting us, can do us no hurt; because it does not deliver us over to Punishment, but transplants us into a more happy State. The Fears of Death are conquered by the Promises of Immortal Life, and Death itself shall at the last Day be swallowed up in Victory, when our dead Bodies shall be raised immortal and glorious, so that though good Men still die, yet they are redeemed from the Curse of the Law, from Death itself as a Curse and a Punishment. But the Popish Purgatory is a place of Punishment, and nothing but Punishment; and therefore is not reconcilable with the Remission and Forgiveness of Sin.

Again I ask, Whether there are two kinds of Punishments due to Sin, Temporal and Eternal, of such a distinct nature and consideration, that the Promise of Forgiveness does not include both? Nay, that God cannot forgive both; that only the Eternal Punishment can be forgiven, but the Temporal Punishment must be satisfied for, or endured by the sinner? If this were the Case indeed, then I would grant, the Promise of Forgiveness could extend only to Eternal Punishments, because God can forgive no other; and the forgiveness of Eternal Punishment, does not include the forgiveness of the Temporal Punishment. But if the Curse of the Law be Eternal Death, and all other Punishments, which can properly be called the Punishment of Sin (for Correction and Discipline is not the Wrath of God, and the Curse of the Law) are only parts of the Curse, and a partial Execution of it; if the only thing, that makes Sinners obnoxious to Temporal Punishments is, that they are under the Sentence of Eternal Death, which God may execute by what degrees he pleases; then to forgive Eternal Punishment, must include the forgiveness of Temporal Punishments, as parts or branches of it: As suppose there were a Law, That no Man should suffer any Bodily Punishments, but such a Malefactor as is condemned to die, but when the Sentence of Death is past upon him, it should be at the Prince's pleasure to defer the Execution of this Sentence, as long as he pleased, and in the mean time to inflict all other Punishments on him, whatever he pleased; in this Case to Pardon the Sentence of Death, would deliver such a Man
from

from all other Punishments too, which by the Law are due only to that Man, who is under the Sentence of Death : and in such a Constitution for any Man to say, that the Prince's Pardon extends only to Life, but does not excuse from Whipping and Pilloring, and perpetual Imprisonment, would be to make the Pardon void, since no Man by the Law can suffer those other Punishments but he who is condemned to Die, and therefore he who is pardoned the Sentence of Death, in consequence of that is pardoned all other Punishments too.

Thus it is here, the original Curse against Sin was, *In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die*, which by the Gospel of Christ is expounded of Eternal Death, and there is no other threatening in all the Gospel against Sin, but Eternal Death ; and therefore all other Punishments are inflicted by Vertue of this Law, and consequently he who is delivered from this Curse of the Law, from Eternal Punishments, is delivered from the whole Punishment due to Sin ; unless they can find some other Law in the Gospel, besides that which threatens Eternal Death, which obliges a Sinner to Punishment.

Again, since they acknowledge, that Christ by his Death has delivered us from Eternal Punishments, I do not think it worth the while to Dispute with them, whether those Sufferings and Calamities, which good Men are exposed to in this World, may properly be called Punishments, or only Correction and Discipline ; but I desire to know, Why they call Purgatory, which is a place of Punishment in the other World, a Temporal Punishment ? for this is an abuse of the Language of Scripture, which makes this World Temporal, and the next World Eternal, as St. Paul expressly tells us ; *the things, which are seen, are temporal, but the things, which are not seen, are eternal*, 2 Cor. 4. 18. And therefore Temporal Punishments signifie the Punishments in this World, but the unseen Punishments, as well as the unseen Rewards, of the next World are Eternal : which is a demonstration, that there is no Purgatory, unless it be Eternal, and then it is but another Name for Hell, and therefore the State of the next World is called either Life or Death, eternal Life, or eternal Death : those *who believe in Christ shall never die*, 11 Joh. 25, 26. Now I desire to know the difference between Living, and Dying, and Perishing in the next World ; for bad Men do not cease to be, nor lose all sense in the next World, no more than good Men ; and therefore Life can only signifie a state of Happiness, and Death a state of Misery, which is much worse than not being : now if good Men must not perish, must not die, but live, in the next World, they must not go to Purgatory, which

Part II. *A Preservative against P O P E R Y.*

211

which is as much perishing, as much dying, as Hell, though not so long; but if they must never die, never perish, they must never suffer the pains of Purgatory, which is a dying and perishing, that is, a state of Torment and Misery, while they continue there.

Let us then see how a Papist, who believes a Purgatory-fire in the next World, wherein he shall be tormented (God knows how long!) for his Sins, can prove that a penitent Sinner shall not be eternally damned: Oh! says he, Christ has died for our Sins, and made atonement for them, and we are pardoned and justified through Faith in his Blood; and what then, may we not still be punished for our Sins? If not, what becomes of Purgatory? If we may, prove, that we shall not be eternally Damned for Sin, which is the proper Punishment of it: For if to be pardoned and justified, signifie to be delivered from Punishment, it signifies our deliverance from the whole Punishment of Sin, since the Scripture does not limit it: if they do not signifie our deliverance from Punishment, then we may be eternally punished for Sin, though we are pardoned and justified.

But we are *redeemed from the curse of the Law, and saved from wrath*. But if such a Man may go to Purgatory, why not to Hell? Or if the Curse of the Law, and the Wrath of God be in Hell, but not in Purgatory, though the torments are equally great, why may not he lie for ever in Purgatory, as well as a thousand Years, with this comfort, that though he be infinitely tormented, yet it is not *the curse of the Law, nor the wrath of God*.

Well, but Christ has promis'd, That those *who believe in him, shall not perish, but have everlasting life*: And that proves that the pains of Purgatory cannot be for ever, for then Christ could not make good his promise of bestowing everlasting Life on them: so I confess one would think, and so I should have thought also, that when Christ promised, that such Believers should not perish, and should never die, that he meant, such Men should not go to Purgatory in the next World; but if falling into Purgatory be *not perishing, and not dying*, it may be *everlasting life* too, for ought I know, and then the pains of Purgatory may be eternal.

Whoever would not forfeit all the assurance the Gospel has given us, of our Redemption from Hell, and a glorious Immortality, must reject the Popish Doctrine of Purgatory, as a flat Contradiction to all the gracious Promises of the Gospel: for Hell, or an eternal Purgatory, is as reconcileable with the Promises of Forgiveness and Immortal Life, as the Popish Purgatory is.

2. This

2. This Doctrine of Purgatory destroys our hope and confidence in the Mediation and Intercession of Christ, and that for these two plain Reasons: 1. As it represents Him less merciful and compassionate; And 2. less powerful, than the wants and necessities of Sinners require him to be. For

I. After all that is said in Scripture of his being so *merciful and compassionate an High-Priest*, a Sinner who hears what is told him of Purgatory, could wish him a great deal more compassionate than he is: for it is no great sign of tenderness and compassion to leave his Members in Purgatory-fire, which burns as hot as Hell. Could I believe this of our Saviour, I should have very mean thoughts of his kindness, and not much rely on him for any thing: We should think him far enough from being a merciful and compassionate Prince, who can be contented to torture his Subjects for a Year together; and it is a wonderful thing to me, that when a merciful Man cannot see a Beast in torment without relieving it, it should be thought consistent with the mercy and compassion of our Saviour, to see us burn in Purgatory for Years and Ages. To be sure this destroys all our hope in him in this World; for why should we think, he will be concerned what we suffer here, who can contentedly let us lie in Purgatory, to which all the Calamities and Sufferings of this Life are meer Trifles? O Blessed and Merciful JESU! pardon such Blasphemies as these. For

II. If he be compassionate, he must want Power to help us; and that destroys the hope of Sinners as much as want of Compassion. It must be want of Will or Power in him, that he does not deliver us from Purgatory as well as Hell: and if he want Power to deliver us from Purgatory, for my part I should more question his Power to deliver from Hell, for that is the harder of the two: if his Blood could not expiate for the Temporal Punishment of Sin, which the Merits of some Supererogating Saints, or the Pope's Indulgence, or the Priests Masses can redeem us from, how could it make expiation for Eternal Punishment? If his Interest in the Court of Heaven will not do the less, how can it do the great? There is no Doctrine more irreconcilable with the perfect Love and Goodness of God, and the Merits and Intercession of our Saviour, which are the Fundamental Doctrines of the Gospel, which is a Dispensation of Love and Grace, than this of Purgatory, and therefore we may safely conclude, that this is no Gospel Doctrine.

2. Let

2. Let us now examine the Doctrine of Invocation of Saints and Angels as our Mediators with God, and see whether it does not disparage the Grace of the Gospel, the Love of God, and of our Mediator and Advocate Jesus Christ, to penitent Sinners. Now a very few words will decide this matter:

1. With respect to God; now can that Man believe, that God is so very gracious to Sinners for the sake of Christ, who seeks to so many Advocates and Mediators to intercede for him with God. To imagine that we want any Mediator to God, but only our High-Priest, who mediates in Vertue of his Sacrifice, is a reproach to the Divine Goodness. The Wisdom and Justice of God may require a Sacrifice, and a High-Priest to make Attonement for Sin, but Infinite Goodness needs not any Entreaties, and meer Intercessions to move him. A truly good Man, who knows a proper Object of his Kindness, needs not to be asked to do good. The use of such Advocates and Mediators among Men, is either to recommend an unknown Person to the favour of the Prince, or fairly to represent his Cause to him, which has been mis-represented by others, or to procure favour for an undeserving Person, or among equal Competitors, to procure some one to be preferred; this is all the use of Intercession among Men: for a good, and wise, and just Prince, will do what is wise, and just, and good, not only without Intercessors, but against all Intercessions to the contrary. Now I suppose no Man will say, that God wants Mediators and Advocates upon any of these accounts; for he knows every Man, understands perfectly his Cause, will never be persuaded by any Intercessions to shew kindness to unfit Objects, that is, to impenitent Sinners; and his Goodness is so unconfined, and so extensive to all, that there can never be any Competition for his Favour; and therefore to multiply Advocates and Mediators to God, must argue a great distrust of his Mercy and Goodness, which a kind and good Prince would take very ill of us.

God indeed has commanded us to Pray for one another in this World, as he has to pray for ourselves; but this is not by way of Interest and Merit, as the Church of *Rome* pretends, the Saints in Heaven pray for us, but by humble Supplications, which is very reconcileable with the Goodness of God, to make Prayer a necessary Condition of granting Pardon and other Blessings we want: but as the use of Prayer for ourselves, is not to move God meerly by our Importunities to do good to us, for we must pray in Faith, that is, with humble Assurance and Confidence that God will hear us, which includes a firm Belief of his readiness to grant, what we pray for; so neither are our

D

Prayers

Prayers for others to move God by our interest in him, that is, they are not the Intercessions of Favourites, but of humble Supplicants.

There was great reason why God should make Prayer the Condition of our receiving, though he wants not our Importunities to move him, because there are a great many excellent Vertues exercised in Prayer; such as great sorrow for Sin, great humility of Mind, faith in God's Promises, the acts of Love, and affiance and trust in God, and a constant dependance on his Grace and Providence for all spiritual and temporal Blessings: and there was great reason why he should command us to pray for others, though he wants none of our Intercessions for them; because it is a mutual exercise of Charity, of Love to our Brethren, and Forgiveness to our Enemies, and is a mighty obligation to do all other acts of Kindness; for those who know it to be their Duty to pray for one another, will think themselves bound to do good to one another also: This becomes those, who live and converse together in this World, because it is a great instrument of Virtue, and that is a reason why God should encourage the exercise of it by promising to hear our Prayers for each other.

But as far as meer goodness is concerned, the Gospel represents God as so very good to Sinners, that there is no need of any Intercession for them: *For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believes in him should not perish, but have everlasting life,* 3 John 16. This was an act of Goodness antecedent to the Incarnation and Death of Christ, and the highest act of Goodness that God could manifest to the World, and therefore secures us of God's love and goodness to Sinners without a Mediator and Advocate; for that love which provided a Mediator for us, was without one, and proves, that it was not for want of goodness, or that he needed entreaties, that he gave his Son to be our Mediator. And therefore hence St. Paul proves, how ready God is to bestow all good things on us: *He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?* 8 Rom. 32. And our Saviour himself represents the goodness of God, by the tenderness and compassion of an earthly Parent: *If ye then being evil (that is, less good than God is) know how to give good things to your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give good things to them that ask him,* 7 Matth. 11. especially in the Parable of the Prodigal, where our Saviour describes the goodness of God to Sinners, by that passion and joy wherewith the Father received his returning Prodigal; nay, he assures his Disciples, that there was no need of his own Intercession to incline God to be good and kind to them: *At that day ye shall ask in*

my

my name, and I say not unto you, That I will pray the Father for you, for the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and believed that I came out from God, 16 Joh. 26, 27. God is so infinitely good, that he needs no Mediators or Intercessors to incline him to all acts of Goodness; but as he is the wise and just Governour of the World, he requires a Sacrifice for Sin, and a High-Priest to make Attonement for it, and to intercede in vertue of the Sacrifice. Such a Mediator Christ is, who alone is both our Sacrifice and our Priest, and therefore our only Mediator; not to incline God to be good, for that he was before, infinitely good, or else he had not given his Son to be our Sacrifice and our High-Priest, but to make Attonement for our Sins, and thereby to reconcile the exercise of God's goodness with his wisdom and justice in Governing the World. Such a Mediator and High-Priest does not lessen the Divine Goodness, for the intention of his Mediation is not to make God good and kind, but to make it wise and just in God to do good to Sinners; but all other Mediators in Heaven, whose business it is by Prayers, and Entreaties, and Interest, and Favour to incline God to be good to such particular Persons as they intercede for, is a real disparagement to the Divine Goodness; as if he would not be good unless he were conquered by Entreaties, and over-ruled by the prevailing Intercessions of some great Favourites: and yet such Mediators as these the Saints, and Angels, and Virgin Mary are, if they be Mediators at all; and therefore to pray to them as to our Mediators, argues such a diffidence and distrust of God's goodness, as does not become the Gospel of our Saviour; this can be no Gospel-Doctrine, because it is irreconcilable with that account the Gospel gives us of the Love of God.*

2. Nor is it less injurious to the Love of our Saviour, to flie to the Prayers and Aids of Saints, and Angels, and the Virgin Mary herself. I shall not now dispute, what encroachment this is upon the Mediatorship of Christ, to make our Addresses and Applications to other Mediators; but whoever does so, must either think that Christ wants Interest with God, without the joynt Intercession of Saints and Angels, or that he wants Kindness to us, and either will not intercede for us at all, or will not do it unless he be prevailed with by the Intercession of Saints, or the Entreaties or the Commands of his Mother. I suppose they will not pretend, that he wants power to do, what we ask of him, when he himself has assured us, *That whatsoever we ask of the Father in his name, he will give it us,* 15 John 16. 16 John 23, 24. Does our Mediator then need other Mediators to intercede with him for us? What! he who became Man for us? who lived a labo-

rious and afflicted life for us? who loved us so, as to give himself for us? who is a merciful and compassionate High-Priest, and touched with a feeling of our Infirmities, being in all things tempted like as we are, yet without Sin?

What a change does this make in the whole Gospel? Had not the Church of *Rome* found out some better security for Sinners, in the Mediation of Saints, and Angels, and the Blessed Virgin, what a hopeless State had we been in? For all that the Gospel tells us is, That God in great love and goodness to Sinners, sent his Son to be our Saviour; and that we might have the greater assurance of his pity and compassion for us, he became Man, Flesh of our Flesh, and Bone of our Bone; and not only so, but submitted to all the weaknesses and infirmities of our Natures, to the greatest shame and reproach, to the sharpest pains, and the most infamous Death, that he might the better know, what our temptations and sufferings are in this World, and might be more sensibly affected with our condition in all our sufferings: This one would have thought, should have given the greatest security to Sinners of his readiness to help them, who did and suffered all this for them; and this is the only security which the Gospel of our Saviour gives us. But it seems Christ is not merciful and pitiful enough; his Virgin-Mother has softer and tenderer passions, and such an interest in him, or authority over him, in the right of a Mother, as some of them have not without Blasphemy represented it, that she can have any thing of him; and thus they suppose the other Saints to be much more pitiful than Christ is, and to have interest enough to protect their Supplicants, or else it is not imaginable why they should need or desire any other Advocates. Now let any Man who understands the Gospel, and finds there how the love of Christ is magnified, not only in dying for us, but in his being a merciful and compassionate High-Priest, that this is the only hope of Sinners, That *if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, who is also a propitiation for our sins*, think the Invocation of Saints, as our Patrons and Advocates, to be a Gospel-Doctrine, if he can.

S E C T.

S E C T. III.

Concerning the Nature of Christian Worship.

3. **A** Nother manifest design of the Gospel, was to reform the Worship of God, not only by extirpating Idolatry, but by purging it from all Pagan and Jewish Superstitions, and to appoint such a Worship as is more agreeable to the Nature both of God and Man. And whoever will take the pains to compare the Worship of the Church of *Rome*, with that Worship which our Saviour has prescribed in the Gospel, will easily discover how unlike they are. Let us then consider what Christ has reformed in the Worship of God, and what kind of Worship he has prescribed to his Disciples:

I. What he has Reformed in the Worship of God ; and that may be comprehended in one word, he has taken away all that was meerly External in Religion : By which I do not mean that our Saviour has forbid all External Acts of Worship, or such External Circumstances as are necessary to the decent and orderly performance of Religious Worship, which the nature and reason of things requires under all Dispensations of Religion ; but that he has laid aside all such External Rites as either were, or were thought to be in themselves Acts of Religion, and to render such Worshippers very acceptable to God. A great many such Rites there were in the Pagan Religion, and a great many in the Jewish Worship of God's own Institution, and a great many more which the Tradition of the Elders, and the Superstition of the Scribes and Pharisees had introduced.

We know the *Jewish* Worship consisted of External Rites ; in their Temple, and Altars, and Sacrifices, and Washings, and Purifications, in New Moons and Sabbaths, and Festival Solemnities, in Consecrated Garments and Vessels for the Service of the Temple, in Distinction of Meats, &c. the very External Observance of these Rites, were Acts of Religion, and necessary to make their Worship acceptable to God ; and the wilful and presumptuous Neglect or Contempt of them, was punished with Death.

Now our Saviour has abrogated all these *Jewish* Rites, and has instituted nothing in the room of them, excepting the two Sacraments, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, which are of a very different Nature and Use, as we shall see presently : He did not indeed, while he was on Earth, blame the Observation of the Law of *Moses*, which till that

that time was in full force, and which he observed himself, but he blamed the External Superstitions of the Pharisees, in washing Cups and Platters, and making broad their Phylacteries, and thinking themselves very righteous Persons, for their scrupulous observance even of the Law of *Moses*, in paying Tithes of Mint and Cummin, &c. while they neglected the weightier matters of the Law, judgement, mercy, and faith, 23 Mat. 23. But when our Saviour was Risen from the Dead, and had accomplished all the Types and Shadows of the Law, then the Apostles with greater freedom opposed a Legal and External Righteousness, and though they did for a time indulge the *Jews* in the Observation of the Rites of *Moses*, yet they asserted the Liberty of the Gentle Converts from that Yoke, as we may see in the first Council at *Antioch*, and in *St. Paul's* Disputes with the *Jews*, in his Epistles to the *Romans* and *Galatians*, and elsewhere. And indeed whoever considers the Nature of the Christian Religion, will easily see, that all those ends, which such External Rites served either in the Jewish or Pagan Religion, have no place here, and therefore nothing that is merely External can be of any use or value in the Christian Worship. As to show this particularly :

1. There is no expiation or satisfaction for Sin under the Gospel, but only the Blood of Christ, and therefore all external Rites are useless to this purpose. Him and him only God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood. Death was the punishment of Sin, and Death is the only expiation of it ; and none else has died for our Sins but Christ alone, and therefore he only is a Propitiation for our Sins ; and yet we know, how great a part both of the Pagan and Jewish Religion was taken up in the expiation of Sin : all their Sacrifices to be sure were designed for this purpose, and so were their Washings and Purifications in some degree, and many other voluntary Severities and Superstitions, this being the principal thing they intended in their Religious Rites, to appease God and make him propitious to them ; since then Christ has made a full and compleat satisfaction and atonement for Sin, and there is no expiation or satisfaction required of us, all external Rites for expiation and atonement can have no place in the Christian Worship, without denying the atonement of Christ, and this necessarily strips Christian Religion of a vast number of external Rites practised both by *Jews* and *Heathens*.

2ly, Nor does the Gospel admit of any legal Uncleanesses and Pollutions, distinction between clean and unclean Meats, which occasioned so many Laws and Observances both among *Jews* and *Heathens* ; so many ways of contracting legal Uncleaness, and so many ways

ways to expiate it, and so many Laws about Eating and Drinking, and such Superstition in Washing Hands, and Cups, and Platters, but our Saviour told his Disciples, *Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth the man, but that which cometh out of the mouth, this defileth the man.* For ^{11, 17, 18,} *whatsoever entereth into the mouth, goeth into the belly, and is cast out into the draught, but those things, which proceed out of the mouth, come forth from the heart, and they defile the man.* For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witnesses, blasphemies, these are the things which defile a man; but to eat with unwashed hands, defileth not a man. And this also delivers Christian Religion from all those Rites and Observances, which concerned legal Cleanness, which were very numerous.

37, Nor is there any Symbolical Presence of God under the Gospel, which puts an end to the legal Holiness of Places and Things. God dwelt among the *Jews* in the Temple at *Jerusalem*, where were the Symbols and Figures of his Presence: it was God's House, and therefore a holy Place, and every thing that belonged to it had a legal Holiness: for the Holiness of Things and Places under the Law, was derived from their relation to God, and his Presence: this was the only place for their Typical and Ceremonial Worship, whither all the Males of the Children of *Israel* were to resort three times a Year, and where alone they were to offer their Sacrifices and Oblations to God: the very place gave vertue to their Worship and Sacrifices, which were not so acceptable in other places; nay, which could not be offered in other places without Sin, as is evident from *Jeroboam's* sin, in setting up the Calves at *Dan* and *Bethel* for places of Worship; and the frequent Complaints of the Prophets against those, who offered Sacrifices in the High Places; and therefore the Dispute between the *Jews* and *Samaritans* was, which was the Place of Worship, whether the Temple at *Jerusalem* or *Samaria*? but Christ tells the Woman of *Samaria*, that there should be no such distinction of Places, in the Christian Worship: *Woman, believe me, the hour cometh when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem worship the Father.* — But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth. Not as if the Father should not be worshipped, neither at *Jerusalem* nor *Samaria*; but that neither the Temple at *Jerusalem* nor *Samaria*, should be the peculiar and appropriate Place of Worship; that God's Presence and Worship should no longer be confined to any one place; that the Holiness of the Place should no longer give any value to the Worship; but those who worshipped God in spirit and in truth, should be accepted by him, where-ever they worship.

^{4 John 21,}
^{23.}

worshipped him. Such spiritual Worship and Worshippers, shall be as acceptable to God at *Samaria* as at *Jerusalem*, and as much in the remotest Corners of the Earth, as at either of them: for God's Presence should no longer be confined to any one place, but he would hear our devout Prayers from all parts of the World, where-ever they were put up to him, and consequently the Holiness of Places is lost: which consists only in some peculiar Divine Presence, and with the Holiness of Places, the external and legal Holiness of Things ceases also: for all other things were Holy only with relation to the Temple, and the Temple-Worship. For indeed God's Typical Presence in the Temple, was only a Figure of the Incarnation: Christ's Body was the true Temple where God dwelt: for which reason he call his Body the Temple, *Destroy this Temple, and I will raise it up in three days*: And the Apostle assures us, that the Fulness of the Godhead dwelt in Christ Bodily, *συναντῶν* really and substantially, in opposition to God's Typical Presence in the material Temple: and therefore when Christ was come, who was the true *Emmanuel* or God dwelling among us, and had by his Incarnation accomplish'd the Type and Figure of the Temple, God would no longer have a Typical and Figurative Presence.

I will not quarrel with any Man, who shall call the Christian Churches, and the Utensils of it, holy things; for being employed in the Worship of God, they ought to be separated from common uses, and reason teaches us to have such places and things in some kind of Religious Respect, upon the account of their relation, not to God, but to his Worship; but this is a very different thing from the Typical Holiness of the Temple and Altar, and other things belonging to the Temple; and there are two plain differences between them, the first with respect to the Cause, the second with respect to the Effect: the cause of this legal Holiness, was God's peculiar Presence in the Temple, where God chose to dwell as in his own House, which sanctified the Temple, and all things belonging to it: the effect was that this Holiness of the Place sanctified the Worship, and gave value and acceptance to it: the first needs no proof, and the second we learn from what our Saviour tells the Scribes and Pharisees: *Wo unto you, ye blind guides, which say, Whosoever shall swear by the temple, it is nothing; but whosoever shall swear by the gold of the temple, he is a debtor. Ye fools and blind; for whether is greater, the gold, or the temple that sanctifieth the gold? And whosoever shall swear by the altar, it is nothing; but whosoever sweareth by the gift that lieth upon it, he is guilty. Ye fools and blind; for whether is greater, the gift, or the altar that sanctifieth the gift?* So that it seems, there

23 Matth.
16, 17, 18,
19.

there was such a Holiness in the Temple and Altar, as conveyed a Holiness and Sanctity to other things, even to the Oblations and Sacrifices, which were offered there. But now whatever Holiness there is in Christian Churches and Oratories, they are sanctified by the Worship, that is performed there, not the Worship sanctified by them. It is the Assembly of Christians themselves, that is the Church, the House, the holy and living Temple of God, not the building of Wood or Stone wherein they meet: God and Christ is peculiarly present in the Assemblies of Christians, though not by a Figurative and Symbolical Presence, and thus he is present in the places, when Christians meet, and which are consecrated and separated to Religious Uses, and there is a natural Decency in the thing, to shew some peculiar Respects to the Places, where we solemnly Worship God; but the presence of God is not peculiar to the place as it was appropriated to the Temple of *Jerusalem*, but it goes along with the Company and the Worship; and therefore the place may be called Holy, not upon account of its immediate relation to God, as God's House, wherein he dwells, but its relation to Christians, and that Holy Worship, which is performed there; and I suppose every one sees the vast difference between these two: and thus all that vast number of Ceremonies, which related to this external and legal Holiness of Places, Vessels, Instruments, Garments, &c. have no place in the Christian Worship, because there is no Typical and Symbolical Presence of God, and consequently no such legal Holiness of Places and Things, under the Gospel.

4ly, Nor are material and inanimate Things made the Receptacles of Divine Graces and Vertues under the Gospel, to convey them to us meerly by Contract and external Applications; like some Amulets or Charms, to wear in our Pockets, or hang about our Necks. There was nothing like this in the *Jewish* Religion, though there was in the *Pagan* Worship, but under the Gospel Christ bestows his holy Spirit on us, as the principle of a new Divine Life, and from him alone we must immediately receive all Divine Influences and Vertue, and not seek for these heavenly Powers in senceless things, which can no more receive, nor communicate Divine Graces to us, then they do Wit and Understanding to those who expect Grace from them; For can Grace be lodged in a rotten Bone, or a piece of Wood? or conveyed to our Souls by perspiration in a kiss or touch?

5ly, The Christian Religion admits of no External or Ceremonial Righteousness: *In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor 5 Matth. uncircumcision, but a new creature, and obedience to the commandments of 20. God, and faith which worketh by love.* The great design of the Gospel,

and of all our Saviour's Sermons, being to make us truly Holy, that we may be Partakers of the Divine Nature, having escaped the Corruption, which is in the World through Lust. There is nothing our Lord does more severely condemn, than an External and Pharisaical Righteousness, which consisted either in observing the External Rites of the Law of *Moses*, or their own Superstitions received by Tradition from their Forefathers, and expressly tells his Disciples, *Except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven*: Now this cuts off every thing, which is External in Religion, at a blow, because it cuts off all hopes and reliances on an External Righteousness, and I believe Men will not be fond of such Superstitions, when they know, they will do them no good.

6ly, And hence it appears, that there can be no place for any thing, that is external, in the Christian Religion, but only for some Federal Rites; such as the two Sacraments of the Gospel are, Baptism and the Lord's Supper; the first of which is our Admission into the New Covenant, the second the Exercise of Communion with Christ in this Gospel-Covenant. And such Rites as these are necessary in all instituted Religions, which depend upon free and voluntary Covenants: for since Mankind has by Sin forfeited their natural Right to God's Favour, they can challenge nothing from him now, but by Promise and Covenant; and since such Covenants require a mutual Stipulation on both sides, they must be transacted by some visible and sensible Rites, whereby God obliges himself to us, and we to him; but these being only the Signs or Seals of a Covenant, are very proper for a Religion, which rejects all External and Ceremonial Righteousness and Worship: for it is not our being in Covenant with God, nor the Sacraments of it, that can avail us, without performing the Conditions of the Covenant, and therefore this does not introduce an External Righteousness.

Now whoever has such a Notion and Idea of the Christian Worship as this, (and let the Church of *Rome* confute it if she can) will easily see without much disputing, how unlike the Worship of the Church of *Rome* is to true Christian Worship.

For whoever only considers, the vast number of Rites and Ceremonies in the Church of *Rome*, must conclude it as Ritual and Ceremonial a Religion as *Judaism* itself; the Ceremonies are as many, more obscure, unintelligible, and useless; more severe and intollerable, than the *Jewish* Yoke itself, which *St. Peter* tells the *Jews*, neither they nor their Fathers were able to bear; it is indeed almost all Outside and

Page-

Pageantry, as unlike the Plainness and Simplicity of the Gospel-Worship, as Show and Ceremony can make it.

It is true, external and visible Worship, must consist of external Actions; and must be performed with such grave and decent Circumstances of Time and Place, and Posture and Habit, as become the Solemnity of Religious Worship; this Reason and Nature teaches, and this the Church of *England* prudently observes, whose Ceremonies are not Religious Rites, but Decent Circumstances of Worship, few in number (as the necessary Circumstances of Action are but few) and grave and solemn in their use: but this is not to place Religion in any thing, that is external, but only to pay an external Homage and Worship to God, which differ as worshipping God in a decent Habit, differs from the Religion of consecrated Habits and Vestments; or as praying to God with an audible Voice, differs from placing Religion in Words and Sounds which we do not understand, or as Kneeling at receiving the Sacrament, differs from a Bodily Worship of the Host in bowing the Knee.

But though the bare number of external Ceremonies, which are always the Seat of Superstition, be a great Corruption of the Christian Worship, yet the number of them is the least fault of the Ceremonies of the Church of *Rome*; as will appear, if we consider a little their Nature:

For 1. Most of their external Rites are professedly intended as Expiations and Satisfaction for their Sins. This is the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of *Rome*, that notwithstanding the Satisfaction made by Christ, every Sinner must satisfy for his own Sins, or have the satisfaction of other Mens applied to him, out of the Treasury of the Church, by the Pope's Indulgences: this is the meaning of all external Penances in Whippings, Fastings, Pilgrimages, and other superstitious Severities; their Backs, or their Feet, or their Bellies must pay for their Sins, unless they can redeem them out of their Pockets too: now it is plain, that these are such external Superstitions, as can have no place in the Christian Religion, which allows of no other Expiation or Satisfaction for Sin, but the Blood of Christ.

2ly, Those Distinctions between Meats, which the Church of *Rome* calls Fasting, (for a Canonical Fast is not to abstain from Food, but only from such Meats as are forbid on Fasting-days) can be no part of Christian Worship, because the Gospel allows of no distinction between clean and unclean Things, and therefore of no distinction of Meats neither: for *meat commendeth us not to God*, 1 Cor. 8. 8. The

1 Tim. 4.
3, 4, 5.

2 Col. 16.
20, 21, 22.

Church of *Rome* indeed does not make such a Distinction between clean and unclean Beasts, as the Law of *Moses* did, and therefore is the more absurd in forbidding the eating of Flesh, or any thing that comes of Flesh, as Eggs, or Milk, or Cheese, or Butter, on their Fasting-days, which is to impose a new kind of *Jewish* Yoke upon us, when the reason of it is ceased. For there is no imaginable reason why it should be an Act of Religion merely to abstain from Flesh, if Flesh have no legal Uncleaness; and if it had, we must all turn *Carthusians*, and never eat Flesh; for how should it be clean one day, and unclean another, is not easie to understand. I am sure St. Paul makes this part of the Character of the Apostacy of the latter Days, That they shall command to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth. For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving: for it is sanctified by the word of God, and prayer. And let no man judge you in meat or drink; — Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world; why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances; touch not, tast not, handle not, which all are to perish with the using, after the commandments and doctrines of men?

And yet, though they do not own the legal Distinctions between clean and unclean Things, their Consecrations would perswade one, that there were something more than a meer legal Uncleaness in all Creatures, viz. that they are all possessed by the Devil and wicked Spirits; for when they consecrate Salt and Water to make their Holy-Water, they first Exorcise both the Salt and Water to cast the Devil out of them: and if such innocent Creatures are possessed, I doubt none can escape; which has made me sometimes wonder, that they durst eat any thing before it was first exorcised, for fear the Devil should take possession of them with their meat. It is certain, if the Christian Religion takes away all such Distinctions between Meat and Drinks, the meer abstaining from Flesh can be no part of Christian Worship, much less so satisfactory and meritorious as the Church of *Rome* pretends, when such Abstinence is appointed as a satisfactory Penance.

3ly, As for the Religion of Holy Places, Altars, Vestments, Utensils, the Church of *Rome* has infinitely out-done the *Jewish* Laws; instead of one Temple at *Jerusalem*, they have thousands to the full as Holy and Sacred as that, as may appear from their Rites of Consecration. Though herein, I confess, they differ, that the Temple of *Jerusalem* was only God's House; and that alone made it a Holy Place, because God was there peculiarly present; but the Popish Churches derive

derive their Sanctity, not so much from the presence of God, (for then they would be all equally Holy) as from some great and eminent Saint, who is peculiarly worshipped there. It is a great argument of the opinion Men have of the Holiness of any Place, to go in Pilgrimage to it, not meerly in Curiosity, but Devotion; as if either going so far to see the Place, were in itself an act of Religion, or their Prayers would be better heard there, than if they prayed at home: Thus they travel to *Jerusalem* to visit the Holy Land and the Sepulchre, and this may be thought in honour of our Saviour who Lived, and Died, and was Buried there: but otherwise I know not any Church or Chappel, which the most devout Pilgrims think worth visiting meerly upon the account of God or Christ: The several Churches or Chappels of the Virgin, especially those which are the most famed for Miracles, or the Churches where the Reliques of some great and adored Saints are lodged, have their frequent Visits, for the sake of the Virgin, or of the Saints; but without some Saint Churches lose their Sacredness and Veneration, which I suppose is the reason why they always take care of some Reliques to give a Sacredness to them, without which no Church can be Consecrated; that is, its Dedication to the Worship of God, cannot make it Holy, unless some Saint take possession of it by his or her Reliques.

This, I confess, is not *Judaism*, for under the *Jewish Law*, all Holiness of Things or Places was derived from their relation to God; now the Names, and Reliques, and wonder-working Images of Saints and the Blessed Virgin, give the most peculiar and celebrated Holiness; and whether this be not at least to ascribe such a Divinity to them, as the Pagans did to their Deified Men and Women, to whom they erected Temples and Altars, let any impartial Reader judge. Those must have a good share of Divinity, who can give Holiness to any thing else.

But since they must have Holy Places, and something to answer the *Jewish Superstition*, who cried, *The Temple of the LORD, the Temple of the LORD*; I cannot blame them for making choice of Saints to inhabitate their Churches, and sanctifie them with their presence, since under the Gospel GOD is no more present in one place than in another: He dwelt indeed in the Temple of *Jerusalem* by Types and Figures, but that was but a Type of God's dwelling in Humane Nature: the Body of Christ was the true Temple, as he told the *Jews*, *Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up*; which he spake of the Temple of his Body: And now Christ is ascended into Heaven, there is no Temple on Earth; and therefore if they will have Temples, they

they must have the Temples of Saints, for the Presence of God is now no more confined to a House, than his Providence is to the Land of *Judaea*, as it was in a very peculiar manner, while the Temple stood there. God dwells not on Earth now, as he did among the *Jews*, but his Presence, *viz.* our Lord Jesus Christ, is removed into Heaven, and therefore he has no House on Earth to answer to the *Jewish* Temple, as the Ancient Fathers asserted that the Christians had neither Temples nor Altars: The Christian Church indeed is a holy and living Temple, wherein the holy Spirit dwells, but that is built not with Stones or Brick, but of living Saints; and therefore the Holiness of Places, and Altars, and Garments, &c. which makes up so great a part of the *Roman* Religion, is a manifest Corruption of the Simplicity of the Christian Worship. The *Jewish* Temple made that Worship most acceptable to God, which was offered there, because it was a Type of Christ, and signified the acceptance of all our Prayers and Religious Services, as offered up to God only in the Name of Christ; but to think that any place is so Holy now, that the bare visiting it, or praying in it, should bestow a greater Holiness upon us, and all we do, should expiate our Sins, or merit a Reward, is no better than *Jewish* or *Pagan* Superstition.

47, That the Church of *Rome* does attribute Divine Vertues and Powers to senseless and inanimate Things, is so evident from that great Veneration they pay to the Reliques, and those great Vertues they ascribe to them, from their Consecrations of their *Agnus Dei*, their Wax-candles, Oyl, Bells, Crosses, Images, Ashes, Holy-water, for the Health of Soul and Body, to drive away evil Spirits, to allay Storms, to heal Diseases, to pardon *Venial*, and sometimes Mortal Sins, merely by kissing or touching them, carrying them in their hands, wearing them about their necks, &c. that no Man can doubt of it who can believe his own eyes, and read their Offices, and see what the daily Practice of their Church is. Whoever has a mind to be satisfied about it, needs only read Dr. *Brevint's* *Saul and Samuel at Endor*, Chap. 15. These things look more like Charms than Christian Worship, and are a great Profanation of the Divine Grace and Spirit; indeed they argue that such Men do not understand, what Grace and Sanctification means, who think that little Images of Wax, that Candles, that Oyl, that Water and Salt, that Bells, that Crosses, can be sanctified by the Spirit of God, and convey Grace and Sanctification by the sight, or sound, or touch, or such external Applications. Christ has given his Holy Spirit to dwell in us, which works immediately upon our minds and rational powers, and requires our concurrence to make his Grace
effectual.

effectual to cleanse and purifie our Souls, and to transform us into the Divine Image ; the grace of the Spirit is to enlighten our Minds, to change our Wills, to govern and regulate our Passions, to instruct, to perswade, to admonish, to awaken our Consciences, to imprint and fix good thoughts in us, to inspire us with holy desires, with great hopes, with divine consolations, which may set us above the fears of the World, and the allurements of it, and give greater fervour to our Devotions, greater strength to our Resolutions, greater courage and constancy in serving God, than the bare powers of Reason, though enforced with supernatural Motives, could do. This is all the Sanctification the Gospel knows, and he who thinks that inanimate Things are capable of this Sanctification of the Spirit, or can convey such Sanctification to us by some Divine and Invisible Effluviūms of Grace, may as well lodge Reason, and Understanding, and Will, and Passions in senseless matter, and receive it from them again by a kiss or touch. To be sure Men who know what the Sanctification of the Spirit means, must despise such Fooleries as these.

gly, That all this encourages Men to trust in an External Righteousness, is too plain to need a proof ; and therefore I shall not need to insist long on it :

For 1. such External Rites are naturally apt to degenerate into Superstition, especially when they are very numerous : The *Jewish* Ceremonies themselves, their Circumcision, Sacrifices, Washings, Purifications, Temple, Altars, New Moons and Sabbaths, and other Festival Solemnities, were the Righteousness of the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, and a Cloak for their Hypocrisy and great Immoralities, though they were never intended by God for the justification of a Sinner. For such External Rites are so much easier to carnal Men, than to subdue their Lusts, and live a holy and vertuous Life, that they are willing to abound in such External Oblervances, and hope that these will make Expiation for their other Sins ; and therefore when the Typical use of these Ceremonies was fulfilled by Christ, the External Rites were Abrogated, that Men might no longer place any hope or confidence in any thing which is meerly External : And therefore that Church which fills up Religion with External Rites and Ceremonies, were there no other hurt in it, lays a Snare for Mens souls, and tempts them to put their trust in an External Righteousness, without any regard to the Internal Purity of Heart and Mind.

Especially 2. when such External Rites are recommended as very acceptable to God, as satisfactions for our Sins, and meritorious of great Rewards ; and this is the use they serve in the Church of *Rome*,

as

as you have already heard. They assert the necessity of Humane Satisfaction; And what are these satisfactory Works wherewith Men must expiate their Sins? The principal of them are Fastings, that is, abstaining from Flesh, and other Acts of Penance, as Whippings, Pilgrimages, and some bodily Severities, or Prayers, that is, saying over such a number of *Ave-Maries*; or Alms, that is to pay for Indulgencies, or to purchase Masses for themselves, or their Friends in Purgatory, or to found some Religious Houses, or to enrich those that are; which are much more satisfactory and meritorious than common acts of Charity to the Poor: All which Men may do, without the least sorrow for Sin, without any true devotion to God, without mortifying any one Lust. They mightily contend for the Merit of Works; but what are their Meritorious Works? Whoever reads the Lives of their Canoniz'd Saints, will easily see what it was that made them Saints: there Characters are usually made up of some *Romish* Superstitions, of their Devotions to the Virgin *Mary*, and their familiar Conversations with her, the severities of their Fasts, and other external Mortifications, their frequenting the Mass, the great numbers of their *Ave-Maries*, pretences to Raptures and Visions, and such wild Extravagancies as made them suspected of Madness, while they lived, and Canoniz'd them for Saints, when they were dead: Other things may be added to fill up their Stories, but these are the glorious Accomplishments, especially of the more Modern Saints: for no Man must be a Saint at *Rome*, who is not a famous Example of Popish Superstitions.

Monkery is thought the most perfect State of Religion among them, and has even Monopolized the Name, for no other Persons are called *the Religions*, but those who belong to one Order or other: And wherein does the Perfection of Monkery consist? 1. In the Vows of Celibacy, Poverty, and Obedience to the Superiors of their Order, which are all external things, no Vertues in themselves, and very often the occasion of great Wickedness. 2. In the strictest Observance of the External Rites and Ceremonies of their Religion; of Masses, and *Ave-Maries*, and Fastings, and Penances, and many of them would be glad, if they could go Pilgrimages too. These things are in perfection in their Monasteries and Nunneries, with such additional Superstitions as are peculiar to particular Orders. As for other true Christian Vertues, they may as soon be found without the Walls of the Monastery, as within.

Now when such External Rites and Observances shall be judged Satisfaction and Expiations for Sin; shall be thought the most highly

ly meritorious, shall be made the Characters of their greatest Saints, and the most perfect state of Religion; I cannot see how any true thorough-paced *Romanist*, can aim at any thing but a Ceremonial Righteousness.

Indeed the true reason why any thinking Men are so fond of an External and Ceremonial Righteousness, is to excuse them from true and real Holiness of Life: all Men know that if they mortify their Lusts, they need not afflict their Bodies with Fastings, and other Severities; that if they have their Conversation in Heaven, they need not travel in Pilgrimages to *Jerusalem* or *Loretto*; that if they take care to obey the Laws of the Gospel, they need no Satisfaction for their Sins, nor no Works of Merit or Supererogation, which are nothing else but meritorious and supererogating Satisfaction: for all Men know, that in the Offices of Piety and Vertue, they can never do more than is their Duty; and therefore as nothing can be matter of Merit, which is our Duty, so the true intention of all Merits and Works of Supererogation, are to supply the place of Duty, and to satisfy for their Sins, or to purchase a Reward, which they have no title to, by doing their Duty; but a good Man, who by believing in Christ, and obeying him, has an interest in his Merits, and a title to the Gospel Promises of Pardon and Eternal Life, needs none of these Satisfactions, Merits, or Supererogations. Now would any Man who believes that he cannot be saved without mortifying his Lusts, be at the trouble of Whippings and Fastings, &c. not to mortify his Lusts, but to keep them, and to make satisfaction for them? Would any Man travel to *Jerusalem*, or the Shrine of any Saint, who believes he shall not be forgiven, unless he leaves his Sins behind him, which he might as well have parted with at home? The true Notion of Superstition is, when Men think to make Satisfaction for neglecting or transgressing their Duty, by doing something which is not their Duty, but which they believe to be highly pleasing to God, and to merit much of him: Now no Man who believes that he cannot please God without doing his Duty, would be so fond of doing his Duty, and doing that which is not his Duty, nor pleasing to God, into the bargain.

3. And yet these meritorious and satisfactory Superstitions are very troublesome to most Men, and though they are willing to be at some pains rather than part with their Lusts, yet they would be at as little trouble as possibly they can; and herein the Church of *Rome*, like a very indulgent Mother, has consulted their ease; for one Man may satisfy for another, and communicate his Merits to him: and therefore those who, by their Friends or Money, can procure a vicarious

Back, need not Whip themselves; they may Fast, and say over their Beads, and perform their Penances and Satisfactions by another, as well as if they did it themselves; or they may purchase Satisfactions and Merits out of the Treasury of the Church, that is, they may buy Indulgencies and Pardons; or it is but entring into some Confraternity, and then you shall share in their Merits and Satisfactions. This is an imputed Righteousness with a witness, and I think very External too, when Men can satisfy and merit by Proxies.

4. And I think it may pass for an External Righteousness too, when Men are sanctified and pardoned by Reliques, Holy-Water, Consecrated Beads, Bells, Candles, *Agnus Dei's*, &c. And how unlike is all this to the Religion of our Saviour, to that Purity of Heart and Mind the Gospel exacts, and to those Means of Sanctification, and Methods of Piety and Vertue it prescribes? Whoever considers what Christian Religion is, can no more think these Observances Christian Worship, than he can mistake Popish Legends for the Acts of the Apostles.

II. Let us now consider what kind of Worship Christ has prescribed to his Disciples: And the general account we have of it, 4 John 23, 24. *But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth, for the Father seeketh such to worship him: God is a spirit, and they that worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth.* Now there are three things included in this Description of Gospel-Worship: 1. That we must Worship God under the Notion of a Pure and Infinite Spirit. 2. That we must Worship him under the Character of a Father. 3. That we must Worship him with the Mind and Spirit.

First, We must Worship God under the Notion of a Pure and Infinite Spirit, who has now confined his peculiar Presence to no place, as he formerly did to the Temple at *Jerusalem*; for this was the present Dispute, Whether God would be worshipped at the Temple at *Jerusalem*, or *Samaria*; as I observed above: In opposition to which, our Saviour tells the Woman, that God is a Spirit, and therefore not confined to any place; he is every-where, and present with us every-where, and may be worshipped every-where by devout and pious Souls: that though for Typical Reasons he had a Typical and Symbolical Presence under the *Jewish* Dispensation, yet this was not so agreeable to his Nature, who is a Spirit, and therefore he must not now be sought for in Houses of Wood and Stone.

And indeed the Reformation of the Divine Worship must begin in rectifying our Notions and Apprehensions of God; for such as we apprehend

prehend God to be, such a kind of Worship we shall pay him; as is evident from the Rites and Ceremonies of the *Pagan* Worship, which was fitted to the Nature and History of their Gods; for where there are no Instituted Rites of Worship, all Mankind conclude, that the Nature of God is the best Rule of his Worship, for all Beings are best pleased with such Honours, as are suitable to their Natures, and no Being can think himself Honoured by such Actions as are a contradiction to his own Nature and Perfections.

Now if God will be worshipped more like a pure and infinite Spirit under the Gospel, than he was under the Law; if this be the fundamental Principle of Gospel Worship, That God is a Spirit, and must be worshipped as a Spirit, I think it is plain, that nothing is more unlike a pure Spirit, than a material Image; nothing more unlike an infinite Spirit, which can have no shape or figure, than a finite and figured Image, made in the likeness of a Man, or of any thing in Heaven and Earth; nothing more unlike an infinite Spirit, which is Life, and Mind, and Wisdom, than a dead and senseless Image; and if under the Law, where God suited his Worship more to a Typical Dispensation than to his own Nature, he would not allow of the Worship of Images, much less is this an acceptable Worship to him under the Gospel, where he will be worshipped as a pure Spirit, for there is nothing in the World more unlike a Living, Infinite, Omnipotent, Omniscient Spirit, than a little piece of dead senseless figured Gold or Silver, Wood or Stone, whatever shape the Carver or Engraver please to give it, since God has none. Now would any Man, who understands this, that God is a Spirit, and will under the Gospel be worshipped as a Spirit, should he go into many Popish Churches and Chapels, and see a vast number of Images and Pictures there, and People devoutly kneeling before them, suspect that these were Christian Oratories, or this Christian Worship, unless he knew something of the matter before? For there you shall find the Pictures of God the Father, and the Ever Blessed Trinity, in different Forms and Representations; the Pictures of the Blessed Virgin, and other Saints and Martyrs devoutly Adored and Worshipped; and would any Man guess, that this were to Worship God as a pure and infinite Spirit? A Spirit cannot be Painted, and then to Worship God as a Spirit, cannot signifie to look upon any Representation of God, when we pray to him, which to be sure cannot give us the Idea of an infinite Spirit. He who Worships God as a Spirit, can have no regard to Matter and Sense, but must apply himself to God as to an infinite Mind, which no Man can do, who gazes upon an Image, or contemplates God in the Art and

Skill of a Painter; for to pray to God in an Image, and in the same thought to consider him as a pure and infinite Mind, is a contradiction; for though a Man, who believes God to be a Spirit, may be so absurd, as to worship him in an Image, yet an Image cannot represent a Spirit to him, and therefore either he must not think at all of the Image, and then methinks he should not look on an Image, when he worships God, for that is apt to make him think of it; or if he does think of the Image, while his mind is filled with such gross and sensible Representations, it is impossible in the same act to address to God, as to a pure invisible, and infinite Spirit. Which shews how unfit and improper Images are in the Worship of God; for they must either be wholly useless, and such as a Man must not so much as look or think on, (which is very irreconcilable with that Worship, which is paid to them in the Church of Rome) or while he is intent upon a Picture or Image, his mind is diverted from the contemplation of a pure and infinite Spirit, and therefore cannot, and does not Worship God as a Spirit.

And the same is true of the Images of Saints and the Blessed Virgin: for though to make Pictures of Men or Women, is no reproach to the Divine Nature, since they are not the Pictures or Images of God, who is a Spirit, but of those Saints, whom they are intended to represent, yet if all Christian Worship be the Worship of God, it is evident, that the Worship of Images, though they be not the Images of God, but of the Saints, can be no part of Christian Worship, because God must be worshipped as a Spirit, and therefore not by any Image whatsoever.

Now the Church of Rome will not pretend, that the Worship of Saints and their Images, is a distinct and separate Worship from the Worship of God, but to justify themselves, they constantly affirm, that they Worship God in that Worship, which they pay to the Saints and their Images; for they know, that to do otherwise, would be to terminate their Worship upon Creatures, which they confess to be Idolatry, since all Religious Worship must terminate on God; and therefore should they give any Religious Worship to Creatures distinct and separate from that Worship they give to God, it were Idolatry upon their own Principles.

Now if they worship God in the Worship of Saints and their Images, then they worship God in the Images of Saints, and that I think is to Worship him by Images: the Worship of a pure infinite and invisible Spirit will admit of no Images, whether of God or Creatures, as the Objects or Mediums of Worship.

But

But it may be said, That this is to graft our own Fancies and Imaginations upon Scripture; for though Christ does say, That God is a Spirit, and must be worshipped in Spirit, he does not say, that to worship God in Spirit is not to worship him by an Image; but to worship God in Spirit, in our Saviour's Discourse with the Woman of *Samarita*, is not opposed to Image-Worship, but to confining the Worship of God to a particular Place, such as the Temple at *Jerusalem* and *Samarita* was; as I observed above. Now to this I answer:

1. To worship God as a Spirit, does in the nature of the thing signify this; for to worship God by any material or sensible Representations is not to worship God as a Spirit; for an infinite Spirit cannot be represented by Matter, nor by any Shape and Figure, because it neither is Material, nor has any Figure.

2. If God will not have his peculiar Presence confined to any place under the Gospel, much less will he be worshipped by Images and Pictures, for it is not such a Contradiction to the Nature of an Infinite Spirit, to shew himself more peculiarly present in one place than in another, as it is to be worshipped by sensible Images and Pictures. Though God fills all places, there may be wise Reasons, why he should confine the Acts of Worship to some peculiar place, and such Typical Reasons there were for it under the Law, but there never can be any Reason, why a Spirit should be represented and worshipped by an Image, which is such a contradiction and dishonour to the Nature of the Spirit; and therefore when God confined his Symbolical Presence to the Temple at *Jerusalem*, yet he strictly forbade the Worship of Images, and much less then will he allow of Image-Worship, when he will not so much as have a Temple.

3. For we must observe farther, that what our Saviour here says, God is a Spirit, and will be worshipped in Spirit, is not a particular Direction, how to worship God, but a general Rule to which the nature of our Worship must be conformed, and therefore it is our Rule, as far as the plain Reason of it extends. Under the Law they were not left to general Rules, but God determined the particular Rites and Ceremonies of his Worship himself; for under the Law God had not so plainly discovered his own Nature to them, as he has done by his Son in the Gospel: For *no man hath seen God at any time, but the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.* And therefore the Nature of God was never made the Rule of Worship before. Though God was as much a Spirit under the Law, as he is under the Gospel, yet this was never assigned as a Reason against Image-Worship, that God is a Spirit: but either that they saw no
Like-

40 Isa. 18.
Ec.

Likeness or Similitude in the Mountain, when God spake to them, 4 *Deut.* 15, 16. or that he is so great and glorious a Being, that nothing in the World is a fit Representation of him: *To whom then will ye liken God? or what likeness will ye compare unto him? — It is he that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers, that stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in, &c.* But that God is a Spirit, who has no Shape and Figure, is a much better Argument against Image-Worship, than all this; but this God had not so plainly declared to them; and if God forbid the Worship of Images, when he thought fit to give no other reason for it, but that he had never appeared to them in any Likeness or Similitude, or that he was too great to be Represented; we our selves may now judge, how unfit it is to worship God by an Image, since our Saviour has declared, that he is a Spirit, who has no Likeness or Figure, and that now he expects to be worshipped by us as a Spirit, and therefore without any Image or sensible Representation.

4 John 22.

4. And yet some Learned Men think, that our Saviour in these Words, had as well respect to the Worship of God by Images, as to his Worship in the Temple: for that he had respect to the Object as well as Place of Worship, is evident from what he adds, *Ye worship ye know not what, we know what we worship, for salvation is of the Jews;* wherein he informs the Woman, that though she inquired only of the Place of Worship, the *Samaritans* were guilty of a greater Fault than setting up the Temple at *Samaria* in opposition to the Temple at *Jerusalem*, viz. in a false Object, or an Idolatrous Manner of Worship, they worshipping a Dove as the Symbol and Representation of God: and thus to Worship God in Spirit, is expressly opposed to worshipping God by Images.

5. However, this comes much to one; for if God being a Spirit his Worship must not be confined to any Place or Symbolical Presence; then he must not be worshipped by an Image, for an Image is a Representative Presence of God, or of the Saints; for the use of Images is to represent that Being whom we Worship as present to us: and therefore if Men consider what they do, they go to Images, as to Divine Presences, to Worship. Images, which are set up in Churches and Chappels for the Worship of God, or of the Saints, are confined to places, and make those places as much appropriate and peculiar Places of Worship, as the *Jewish* Temple was, excepting that the Temple was but one, and they are many. Heathen Temples were the Houses of their Gods, or of their Images, which were the Presence of their Gods;

God; and if we must not appropriate the Presence of God to any Place, then we must not Worship him by Images, which are of no use but to represent God as sensibly present, with the Image, or in the place, where the Image is. If God be better worshipped before an Image, than without one, then the Worship of God is more confined to that place, where an Image is, than to those places, which have no Images. I cannot see how to avoid this, that if God must be worshipped by Images, then there must be appropriated Places of Worship, viz. where the Image is, if there be no appropriate Places of Worship under the Gospel, like the Temple at Jerusalem, then God must not be worshipped by Images; for an Image must be in some place, and if God must be worshipped at, or before his Image, then that is the proper and peculiar Place of Worship, where his Image is; nay, though the Image be not fixt to any place, but be carried about with us, yet if we must worship God by Images, the Image is not only the Object, but makes the Place of Worship, for there we must worship God, where his Image is, if we must worship him before his Image. It is impossible to separate the Notion of Image-Worship, from the Notion of a peculiar and appropriate Place of Worship; for the Image determines the Place, as the Presence of the Object does; and as under the Gospel we may worship God any where, because he is an infinite Spirit, and fills all places; and is equally present with all devout Worshippers, where ever they worship him: So where the Image is consecrated for a Divine Presence, it is not only the Object, but the peculiar Place of Worship, because God is peculiarly present there, or more acceptably worshipped there, than where there is no Image. So that if a peculiar and appropriate Place of Worship be contrary to the Notion of an infinite Spirit, the Worship of Images is much more so, for besides that they are gross and corporeal Representations of a Spirit, they are Divine Presences too, and appropriate Places of Worship.

Secondly, As God must be worshipped under the Notion of a Spirit, so under the Character of a Father; as our Saviour expressly tells us, *The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth, for the Father seeketh such to worship him; and therefore he taught his Disciples to pray, Our Father which art in heaven.* Under the Law God was worshipped as a King, and that not so much as the King of the whole World, but as in a peculiar manner the King of Israel: *The Lord reigneth, let the people tremble, he sitteth between the cherubims, (in his Temple at Jerusalem) let the earth be moved.* *The Lord is great in Zion, and he is high above all people.* But under the Gospel

4 John 23.

99 Psal. 1.

Gospel the peculiar Character of God is a Father, and that not only as he is the Maker of all Men, and so the Father of all, but as he is the Father of Christ, and in him the Father of all Christians. Now this makes a vast difference in our Worship, from what is daily practised in the Church of Rome. For,

1. When we pray to God as *our Father*; we must pray to him as dwelling in Heaven: as our Saviour teaches us to say, *Our Father, which art in heaven*. For as a Father, Heaven is his House and Habitation; in *my Father's house are many mansions*; that is, in Heaven, which is his House as a Father, as the Temple at *Jerusalem*, was his Palace considered as the King of *Israel*; and this is one reason our Saviour intimates, why the Presence of God shall no longer be confined to any particular Place or Temple, because he shall be worshipped as the Universal Father, not as the King of *Jury*; Now when he is to be worshipped as a Father from all Parts of the World, he must have such a Throne and Presence to which all the World may equally resort, and that can be no other then his Throne in Heaven, whither we may send up our Prayers from all Corners of the Earth; but had he confined his Presence to any Place on Earth, as he did to the Temple of *Jerusalem*, the rest of the World must have been without God's peculiar Presence, could have had no Temple nor Place of Worship, but at such a distance that they could never have come at it: for though God fills all places, it is a great absurdity to talk of more Symbolical Presences of God than one: for a Symbolical Presence confines the Unlimited Presence of God to a certain Place, in order to certain Ends, as to receive the Worship, that is paid him, and to answer the Prayers, that are made to him; and to have more than One such Presence as this, is like having more Gods than One.

So that all our Worship under the Gospel, must be directed to God in Heaven; and that is a plain Argument, that we must not worship God in Images on Earth, for they neither can represent to us the Majesty of God in Heaven, nor is God present with the Image to receive our Worship there: if God must now be worshipped as dwelling in Heaven, it is certain there can be no Object of our Worship on Earth; for though God fill all places with his Presence, yet he will be worshipped only as sitting on his Throne in Heaven; and then I am sure he must not be worshipped in an Image on Earth, for that is not his Throne in Heaven. This the Mercy-seat in the Holy of Holies was an Emblem of; for the Holy of Holies in the *Jewish* Temple, did signify Heaven, and the Mercy-seat covered with Cherubims, signified the Throne of God in Heaven, whither we must
lift

lift up our eyes and hearts when we pray to him: for tho' it is indifferent from what place we put up our Prayers to God, while we have regard to the External Decency of Religious Worship, yet it is not indifferent whither we direct our Prayers; for we must direct our Prayers *to the throne of grace, if we would obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need.* Now the Throne of Grace is only in Heaven, whither Christ is ascended to make Atonement for us; for he's the true Propitiatory or Mercy-seat: And therefore if to direct our Prayers to God, to his Picture or Image, or to the Images of the Virgin *Mary*, or any other Saints, did not provoke God to jealousy, yet it would do us no good, unless such Images are God's Throne of Grace, for all other Prayers are lost, which are not directed to God on his Throne of Grace, where alone he will receive our Petitions. If a Prince would receive no Petitions but what were presented to him sitting on such a Throne, all Men would be sensible how vain a thing it were to offer any Petition to him else-where. And yet thus it is here: A Sinner dare not, must not approach the Presence of God, but only on his Mercy-seat and Throne of Grace; for any where else our God is a Consuming Fire, a Just and a Terrible Judge: now God has but one Throne of Grace, and that is in Heaven, as the Mercy-seat was in the Holy of Holies, which was a Type of Heaven; thither Christ ascended with his Blood to sprinkle the Mercy-seat, and to cover it with a Cloud of Incense, which are the Prayers of the Saints, as the High-Priest did once a Year in the Typical Holy Place. Which is a plain proof, that all our Prayers must be immediately directed to God in Heaven, where Christ dwells, who is our true Propitiatory and Mercy-seat, who has sprinkled the Throne of God with his own Blood, and has made it a Throne of Grace, and where he offers up our Prayers as Incense to God.

2. To worship God as our Father, signifies to worship him only in the Name and Mediation of his Son Jesus Christ: for he is our Father only in Jesus Christ, and we can call him Father in no other Name. By the right of Creation he is our Lord, and our Judge, but he is the Father of Sinners only by Adoption and Grace, and we are adopted only in Christ: so that if Christian Worship be the Worship of God as a Father, then we must pray to God in no other Name, but of his own Eternal Son: The Virgin *Mary*, though she were the Mother of Christ, yet does not make God our Father; and then no other Saint, I presume, will pretend to it: which shews what a Contradiction the Invocation of Saints is to the Nature of Christian Worship, and how unavailable to obtain our Requests of God. If we must

worship God only as our Father, then we must worship him only in the Name of his Son, for he owns himself our Father in no other Name ; and if he will hear our Prayers, and answer our humble Petitions only as a Father, then he will hear only those Prayers which are made to him in the Name of his Son : How great Favourites soever the Blessed Virgin and other Saints may be, if God hear Prayers only as a Father, it is to no purpose to pray to God in their Names, for he hears us not.

3. To worship God as a Father, signifies to pray to him with the humble assurance and confidence of Children : This is *the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba Father*. For because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying *Abba Father*. A dutiful Son does not question his Father's good will to him, nor rediness to hear and answer all his just Requests, he depends upon the kindness of his Father, and his interest and relation to him, and seeks for no other Friends and Favourites to recommend him : And upon this account also the Invocation of Saints is a Contradiction to the Gospel-Spirit of Prayer, to that Spirit of Adoption, which teaches us to cry *Abba Father* ; for surely those have not the hope, and assurance, and *πίστις* of Children, who dare not go to their Father themselves, but must send their Petitions to him by the hands of Favourites and Intercessors. To pray to God in the Name of Christ, is only to pray to him as Sons, for it is in his Name only that he owns us for Sons ; and this is the true Spirit of Adoption, in the Name and Mediation of Christ, to go to God, as Children to a Father ; but to pray to him in any other Name, how powerful soever, is not to go to him as a Father, but as to our Lord and King, who must be addressed to by the Mediation of some great Favourites. To pray to God in any other Name, which does not make us his Sons, is to distrust our Relation to him, as our Father in Christ ; and this is contrary to the Spirit of Adoption, which teaches us to call God Father, and gives us that assurance of his Fatherly goodness to us in Christ, that we need and desire no other Advocates.

Thirdly, To worship God in Spirit, is to worship him with our Mind and Spirit ; for that is most agreeable to the Nature of God, who is a Spirit. God cannot be worshipped but by a reasonable Creature, and yet a Beast may worship God as well as a Man, who worships without any act of Reason and Understanding, or devout Affections. To pray to God without knowing what we say, when neither our Understandings nor Affections can joyn in our Prayers, is so absurd a Worship of a pure Mind, that Transubstantiation itself

is

is not more contrary to Sense, than Prayers in an Unknown Tongue are to the Essential Reason and Nature of Worship. I suppose no Man will say, that to pray to God, or praise him in words which we do not understand, is to worship God in Spirit, unless he thinks that a Parrot may be taught to pray in the Spirit: What difference is there between a Man's not speaking, and speaking what he does not understand? Just so much difference there is between not praying, and praying what we do not understand: and he honours God to the full as much, who does not pray at all, as he who prays he knows not what; and, I am sure, he affronts him a great deal less: However, if Christian Worship be to worship God in Spirit, Prayers in an Unknown Tongue, in which the Mind and Spirit cannot be concerned, is no Christian Worship.

S E C T. IV.

*Concerning the Reformation and Improvement of Humane Nature,
by the Gospel of C H R I S T.*

4 **A** Nother principal end and intention of the Gospel, was to cure the Degeneracy of Mankind, and to advance Humane Nature to its utmost Perfection: for as Man fell from his original Happiness, by falling from the Purity and Integrity of his Nature, so there was no restoring him to his lost Happiness, much less no advancing him to a more perfect State of Happiness, not to an earthly, but to an heavenly Paradise, without changing and transforming his Nature, and renewing him after the Image of God. And therefore our very entrance into Christianity, is a new Birth: *Except a man be born* 3 Joh. 3, 6. *of water, and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God: That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit.* And such a Man is called a new Creature; and a Christian Life is a 8 Rom. 1. *newness of Life, and living after the Spirit, and walking after the Spirit:* and this new Nature is the Divine Nature, the Image of God, the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness, which is 4 Eph. 24. 3 Colos. 10. *renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him.*

So that there are two things, wherein this new Nature consists, Knowledge, and Righteousness, or true Holiness, and I doubt it will appear, that the Church of Rome is no great Friend to either.

I. Knowledge: Now I suppose neither the Church of Rome, nor any one for her, will pretend that she is any great Friend to Knowledge:

ledge: She is so horribly afraid of Heresie, that she endeavours to nurse Men up in Ignorance of their Religion, for fear they should prove Hereticks; and indeed she has some reason for it: for the Church of *Rome* was never so Triumphant as in the most ignorant and barbarous Ages; but as Knowledge broke in upon the World, so Men turn'd Hereticks apace.

If there be any knowing Papists (and it would be very hard, if there should be none) they are not beholding to their Church for it, which deprives them of all the means of Knowledge: for she will not allow them to believe their Senses, which is one way of knowing things, and the most certain we have: and yet she commands us to believe Transubstantiation, which no Man can do who believes his Senses: and if I must not believe my Senses in so plain a matter, as what is Bread and Wine, I know no reason I have to believe them in any thing, and then there is an end of all Knowledge, that depends on Sense; as the proof of the Christian Religion itself does: for Miracles are a sensible proof, and if I must not trust my Senses, I cannot rely on Miracles, because I cannot know, whether there be any such thing as a real Miracle.

The Church of *Rome* also forbids Men the use of Reason in Matters of Religion, will not allow Men to judge for themselves, nor to examine the Reasons of their Faith, and what knowledge any Man can have without exercising his Reason and Understanding, I cannot guess; for to know without understanding, sounds to me like a contradiction.

She also denies Christians the use of the Bible, which is the only means to know the revealed Will of God: and when Men must neither believe their Senses, nor trust their Reason, nor read the Scripture, it is easy to guess what knowing and understanding Christians, they must needs be.

But it may be said, that notwithstanding this, the Church of *Rome* does Instruct her Children in the true Catholick Faith, though she will not venture them to judge for themselves, nor to read the Scriptures, which is the effect of her great Care of them, to keep them Orthodox: for when Men trust to their own fallible Reasons, and private Interpretations of Scripture, it is a great hazard that they do not fall into one Heresie or other: but when Men are taught the pure Catholick Faith without any danger of Error and Heresie, is not this much better, then to suffer them to reason and judge for themselves, when it is great odds, but they will judge wrong.

Now

Now this would be something indeed, did the Church of *Rome* take care to instruct them in all necessary Doctrines, and to teach nothing, but what is true, and could such Men, who thus tamely receive the Dictates of the Church, be said to know and to understand their Religion. How far the Church of *Rome* is from doing the first, all Christians in the World are sensible but themselves, but that is not our present Dispute; for though the Church of *Rome* did instruct her People into the true Christian Faith, yet such Men cannot be said to know and understand their Religion; and to secure the Faith by destroying Knowledge, is a direct Contradiction to the design of the Gospel, which is to make Men wise and understanding Christians. For no Man understands his Religion, who does not in some measure know the reasons of his Faith, and judge whether they be sufficient or not; who knows not how to distinguish between Truth and Error, who has no Rule to go by, but must take all upon trust, and the credit of his Teachers; who believes whatever he is told, and learns his Creed, as School-Boys do their Grammar, without understanding it: This is not an active, but a kind of passive Knowledge; such Men receive the impression, that is made on them, as Wax does, and understand no more of the matter; now will any one call this the knowledge and understanding of a Man, or the discipline of a Child?

But suppose there were some Men so dull and stupid, that they could never rise higher; that they are not capable of inquiring into the reasons of things, but must take up their Religion upon trust; yet will any Man say, that this is the utmost perfection of Knowledge, that any Christian must aim at? is this the meaning of the word of God dwelling in us richly in all wisdom? is this the way to give ^{3 Col. 16.} an answer to any one, who asks a reason of the hope that is in us? The perfection of Christian Knowledge is a great and glorious attainment; to understand the secrets of God's Laws, those depths and mysteries of Wisdom and Goodness in the Oeconomy of Man's Salvation; to see the Analogy between the Law and the Gospel, how the legal Types and ancient Prophecies received their accomplishment in Christ; how far the Gospel has advanced us above the State of Nature, and the Law of *Moses*; what an admirable design it was to redeem the World by the Incarnation, and Death, and Sufferings, and Intercession of the Son of God; what mysteries of Wisdom and Goodness the Gospel contains; the knowledge of which is not only the perfection of our understandings, but raises and ennobles our Minds, and transforms us into the Divine Image: These things were revealed, that they might be known, not that they should be concealed from the World,

or

or neglected and despised ; but this is a Knowledge, which cannot be attained without diligent and laborious inquiries, without using all the reason and understanding we have, in searching the Scriptures, and all other helps which God has afforded us.

Now if Christian Knowledge be something more than to be able to repeat our Creed, and to believe it upon the authority of our Teachers, if the Gospel of our Saviour was intended to advance us to a true Manly Knowledge, Christ and the Church of *Rome* seem to have two very different designs, our Lord in causing the Gospel to be wrote, and publisht to the World, the other in concealing it as much as she can, and suffering no body to read it without her leave, as a dangerous Book, which is apt to make Men Hereticks ; for it is hard to conceive, that the Gospel was written, that it might not be read, and then one would guess, that he by whose authority and inspiration the Gospel was written, and those by whose authority it is forbid to be read, are not of a mind in this matter.

1. This I think in the first place is an evident proof, that to forbid Christian People to read and study and meditate on the Word of God, is no Gospel-Doctrine, unless not to read the Bible, be a better way to improve in all true Christian Knowledge and Wisdom, than to read it : for that is the Duty of Christians ; to grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ ; this was one great end of publishing the Gospel to the World, to enlighten and improve Mens understandings, as well as to govern their lives ; and though we grant, Men may be taught the Principles of Christian Religion, as Children are, without reading the Bible, yet if they will but grant, that studying and meditating on the Holy Scriptures, is the best and only way to improve in all true Christian Knowledge, this shews how contrary this Prohibition of Reading the Scriptures is to the great design of the Gospel, to perfect our knowledge in the Mysteries of Christ.

2^{ly}, This is a mighty presumption also against Transubstantiation, that it is no Gospel Doctrine, because it overthrows the very Fundamental Principles of Knowledge, which is a direct Contradiction to the Design of the Gospel, to advance Divine Knowledge to the utmost Perfection it can attain in this World.

Whoever has his eyes in his head must confess, that the Doctrine of Transubstantiation is contrary to Sense ; for were our Senses to be Judges of this matter, they would pronounce the Bread and Wine after Consecration, to be Bread and Wine still ; and therefore whatever reason there may be to believe it not to be Bread and Wine, but Flesh and Blood, yet it must be confessed, that our Faith in this matter

con-

contradicts our Sense; for even *Roman* Catholick Eyes and Noses and Hands, can see and feel and smell nothing but Bread and Wine: and if to our senses it appears to be nothing but Bread and Wine, those who believe it to be the Natural Body and Blood of Christ, believe contrary to what they see.

Thus there is nothing more contrary to the natural Notions we have of things, than the Doctrine of Transubstantiation: for if this Doctrine be true, then the same individual Body of Christ is in Heaven at the right Hand of God, and on ten thousand Altars, at a great distance from each other on Earth, at the same time. Then a Humane Body is contracted into the compass of a Wafer, or rather subsists without any Dimensions, *without extension of parts, and independent on place.*

Now not to dispute, whether this be true or false, my only inquiry at present is, whether this do not contradict those natural Notions all Men have of the Properties of a Humane Body: let a Man search his own mind, and try, whether he find any such Notion of a Body, as can be present at more places than one at the same time: a Body that is without Extension, nay that has Parts without Extension, and therefore without any distinction too: for the Parts of an Organical Body must be distinguished by place and situation, which cannot be, if they have no Extension; a Body, which is present without occupying a place, or being in a place: if we have no such natural Notion of a Body, as I am sure I have not, and I believe no Man else has, then let Transubstantiation be true or false, it is contrary to the natural Notions of our Minds, which is all I am at present concerned for: Thus let any Man try, if he have any notion of an Accident subsisting without any substance, of a white and soft and hard nothing, of the same Body, which is extended and not extended, which is in a place, and not in a place at the same time: for in Heaven, I suppose, they will grant, the Body of Christ fills a place, and has the just dimensions and proportions of a Humane Body, and at the same time in the Host the very same Body is present, without any extension, and independent on place; that is, the same Body at the same time is extended and not extended, fills a place and fills no place, which, I suppose, they mean by being *Independent on Place*; now is and is not, is a contradiction to natural Reason, and I have no other natural Notion of it, but as of a contradiction, both parts of which cannot be true. Let us then briefly examine, whether it be likely, that Transubstantiation, which contradicts the evidence of Sense, and the natural Notions of our Minds, should be a Gospel-Doctrine, considering

ing the Gospel as the most divine and excellent Knowledge, and most perfective of humane Understandings : For,

1. This Doctrine of Transubstantiation, is so far from perfecting our Knowledge, that it destroys the very Principles of all Humane Knowledge : All natural Knowledge is owing either to Sense or Reason, and Transubstantiation contradicts both, and whoever believes it, must believe contrary to his Senses and Reason, which if it be to believe like a Catholick, I am sure, is not to believe like a Man ; if the perfection of Knowledge consist in contradicting our own Faculties, Transubstantiation is the most perfect Knowledge in the World ; but however, I suppose no Man will say, that this is the natural perfection of Knowledge, which overthrows the most natural Notions we have of things : and yet,

2. All supernatural Knowledge must of necessity be grafted upon that which is natural ; for we are capable of revealed and supernatural Knowledge, only as we are by nature reasonable Creatures, and destroy Reason, and Beasts are as fit to be preached to as Men : And yet to contradict the plain and most natural Notions of our Minds, is to destroy Humane Reason, and to leave Mankind no Rule or Principle to know and judge by. No Man can know any thing, which contradicts the Principles of natural Knowledge, because he has only these natural Principles to know by ; and therefore however his Faith may be improved by it, he forfeits his natural Knowledge, and has no supernatural Knowledge in the room of it : For how can a Man know and understand that which is contrary to all the natural Knowledge and Understanding he has ? There may be some revealed Principles of Knowledge super-added to natural Principles, and these things we may know to be so, though we have no natural Notion of them, and this perfects, because it enlarges our Knowledge ; as the Knowledge of three Divine Persons super-added to the natural Belief of one Supreme God ; which does not overthrow the belief of one God, but only acquaints us, that there are three Divine Persons in the Unity of the Godhead, which, whatever difficulty there may be in apprehending it, yet overthrows no natural Notion : this is an improvement of Knowledge, because we know all we did before, and we know something more, that as there is one God, so there are three Persons, who are this one God ; and though we have no natural Notion of this, how three Persons are one God, because we know no distinction between Person and Essence in Finite Beings, yet we have no natural Notion, that there cannot be more Persons than one in an Infinite Essence ; and therefore this may be known by Revelation, because

because there is no natural Notion against it. But now I can never know that which is contrary to all the Principles of Knowledge I have; such Men may believe it, who think it a Vertue to believe against Knowledge: Who can believe that to be true, which they know to be false? For whatever is contrary to the plain and necessary Principles of Reason, which all Mankind agree in, I know must be false, if my Faculties be true, and if my Faculties be not true, then I can know nothing at all, neither by Reason nor Revelation, because I have no true Faculties to know with: Revelation is a Principle of Knowledge as well as Faith, when it does not contradict our natural Knowledge of things, for God may teach us that which Nature does not teach; and thus Revelation improves, enlarges, and perfects Knowledge: in such cases Faith serves instead of natural Knowledge, the Authority of the Revelation instead of the natural Notion and Idea's of our Minds; but I can never know that by Revelation which contradicts my natural Knowledge; which would be not only to know that, which I have no natural Knowledge of, which is the knowledge of Faith, but to know that by Revelation, which by Reason and Nature I know cannot be; which is to know that, which I know cannot be known, because I know it cannot be:

So that Transubstantiation, which contradicts all the evidence of Sense and Reason, is not the Object of any Humane Knowledge, and therefore cannot be a Gospel-Revelation, which is to improve and perfect, not to destroy Humane Knowledge: I can never know it, because it contradicts all the Notions of my Mind; and I can never believe it without denying the truth of my Faculties, and no Revelation can prove my Faculties to be false; for I can never be so certain of the truth of any Revelation, as I am, that my Faculties are true; and could I be persuaded, that my Faculties are not true, but deceive me in such things, as I judge most certain and evident, then I can no more believe them as to any Revelation, than I can as to their natural Reasonings, for the same Faculties must judge of both, and if the Faculty be false, I can trust its judgment in neither.

3^d, The Doctrine of Transubstantiation destroys all possible certainty, what the true sense and interpretation of Scripture is, and thereby overthrows all supernatural Knowledge. The Scripture we know is expounded to very different and contrary Sences, and made to countenance the most monstrous and absurd Doctrines; Witness all the ancient Heresies which have been Fathered on the Scriptures. Now what way have we to confute these Heresies, but to shew, either that the words of Scripture will not bare such a sense, or at least do not

H

neces-

necessarily require it ; that such an Interpretation is contrary to Sense, to Reason, to the natural Notions we have of God, and therefore is in itself absurd and impossible ? But if Transubstantiation be a Gospel Doctrine, I desire any Papist, among all the ancient Heresies, to pick out any Doctrine more absurd and impossible, more contrary to Sense and Reason, then the Doctrine of Transubstantiation is ; and then it is no Argument against any Doctrine, or any Exposition of Scripture, that it is absurd and impossible, contrary to Sense and Reason, for so Transubstantiation is ; and if we may believe one absurd Doctrine, we may believe five hundred, how absurd soever they be : And then what defence has any Man against the most monstrous Corruptions of the Christian Faith ? Is this the way to improve Knowledge, to destroy all the certain marks and characters of Truth and Error, and to leave no Rule to judge by ? If the design of the Gospel was to improve our Minds by a knowing and understanding Faith, Transubstantiation, which overthrows the certainty both of natural and revealed Knowledge, can be no Gospel Doctrine.

3. The Authority of an infallible Judge, whom we must believe in every thing, without examining the reasons of what he affirms, nay, though he teaches such Doctrines as appear to us most expressly contrary to Sense, and Reason, and Scripture, is no Gospel Doctrine, because it is not the way to make Men wise and understanding Christians, which is the great design of the Gospel, for to suspend the exercise of Reason and Judgment, is not the way to improve Mens knowledge : an infallible Teacher, and an infallible Rule do indeed mightily contribute to the improvement of Knowledge ; but such an infallible Judge, as the Church of *Rome* boasts of, can only make Men ignorant and stupid Believers : For there is a vast difference between an infallible Teacher, and an infallible Judge, which few Men observe, at least have not well explained ; for an infallible Teacher is only an external Proponent, and while Men only teach and instruct, how infallible soever they are, every Man is at liberty to use his own Reason and Judgement ; for though the Teacher be infallible, he that learns must use his own Reason and Judgement, unless a Man can learn without it : But now an infallible Judge is not contented to teach and instruct, which is an Appeal to the Reason of Mankind, but he usurps the Office of every Mans private Reason and Judgement, and will needs judge for all Mankind, as if he were an *Universal Soul*, an *Universal Reason and Judgement*, that no Man had any Soul, any Reason or Judgement but himself : for if every Man has a private Reason and Judgement of his own, surely every Man must have a right

to the private exercise of it ; that is, to judge for himself ; and then there can be no such Universal Judge, who must be that to every Man, which in other cases his own private Reason and Judgement is, which is to un-Soul all Mankind in matters of Religion. And therefore though there have been a great many infallible Teachers, as *Moses* and the Prophets, Christ and his Apostles, yet none ever pretended to be infallible Judges, but the Church of *Rome* ; that is, none ever pretended to deny People a liberty of judging for themselves, or ever exacted from them an universal Submission to their infallible Judgment without exercising any act of Reason or Judgment themselves. I am sure Christ and his Apostles left People to the exercise of their own Reason and Judgement, and require it of them ; they were infallible Teachers, but they did not judge for all Mankind, but left every Man to judge for himself, as every Man must and ought, and as every Man will do, who has any Reason and Judgment of his own : but an infallible Judge, who pretends to judge for all Men, treats Mankind like Brutes, who have no reasonable Souls of their own.

But you'll say, this distinction between an infallible Teacher and an infallible Judge, is very nice and curious, but seems to have nothing in it ; for does not he who teaches infallibly, judge infallibly too ? And must I not submit my private Judgment, which all Men allow to be fallible, to a publick infallible Judgment, which I know to be infallible ? If I know that I may be deceived, and that such a Man cannot be deceived, is it not reasonable for me to be governed by his Judgment, rather than my own ? I answer, All this is certainly true as any demonstration, but then it is to be considered, that I cannot be so certain of any Man's Infallibility, as to make him my Infallible Judge, in whose Judgment I must acquiesce, without exercising any Reason or Judgment of my own : and the reason is plain, because I cannot know that any Man teaches infallibly, unless I am sure that he teaches nothing that is contrary to any natural or revealed Law. Whoever does so, is so far from being Infallible, that he actually errs ; and whether he does so, I cannot know, unless I may judge of his Doctrine by the Light of Nature, and by Revelation : and therefore tho' there may be an Infallible Teacher, there never can be any Infallible Judge, to whom I must submit my own Reason and Judgment, because I must judge of his Doctrine myself, before I can know that he is Infallible.

As for instance, when *Moses* appeared as a Prophet and a Law-giver to the Children of *Israel*, there was no written Law, but only the Law of Nature ; and therefore those great Miracles he wrought, gave

authority to his Laws, because he contradicted no necessary Law of Nature: but had any other Person at that time wrought as many Miracles as *Moses* did, and withal taught the Worship of many Gods, either such as the *Egyptians*, or any other Nations worshipped at that time, this had been reason enough to have rejected him as a false Prophet, because it is contrary to the natural Worship of one Supreme God, which the Light of Nature teaches.

When Christ appeared, there was a written Law, the Writings of *Moses* and the Prophets, and all the Miracles he wrought could not have proved him a true Prophet, had he contradicted the Scriptures of the Old Testament; and therefore his Doctrine was to be examined by them, and accordingly he appeals to *Moses* and the Prophets to bear Testimony to his Person and Doctrine, and exhorts them to search the Scriptures, which gave testimony to him: and how the Miracles he wrought gave authority to any new Revelations he made of God's Will to the World, since he did not contradict the old. The Law of Nature, and the Laws of *Moses*, were the Laws of God; and God cannot contradict himself: and therefore the Doctrine of all new Prophets, even of Christ himself, was to be examined, and is to be examined to this day, by the Law and the Prophets; and therefore though he was certainly an Infallible Teacher, yet Men were to judge of his Doctrine, before they believed him; and he did not require them to lay aside their Reason and Judgment, and submit to his Infallible Authority, without Examination.

So that all this while, there could be no Infallible Judge to whom all Men were bound to submit their own private Reason and Judgment, and to receive all their Dictates as Divine Oracles, without Examination; because they could not know them to be such Infallible Teachers, till they had examined their Doctrine by the Light of Nature and the Law of *Moses*: and we cannot to this day know that *Moses* and Christ were true Prophets, but in the same way.

Since the writing of the New Testament, there is a farther Test of an Infallible Teacher, if there be any such in the World; that he neither contradicts the Light of Nature, nor the true Intent of the Law of *Moses*, nor alter or add to the Gospel of Christ; and therefore there can be no Infallible Judge, because he never so Infallible, we can never know that he is so, but by the agreement of his Doctrine with the Principles of Reason, with the Law and the Prophets, and with the Gospel of Christ; and therefore must examine his Doctrine by these Rules, and therefore must judge for ourselves, and not suffer any Man to judge for us, upon a pretence of his Infallibility.

Could

Could I know that any Man were Infallible, without judging of his Doctrine, then indeed there were some reason to believe all that he says, without any inquiry or examination; but this never was, never can be: and therefore though there may be an Infallible Teacher, there can be no Infallible Judge to whom I must submit my own Reason and Judgment, without asking any Questions. Which by the way shews, how ridiculous that Sophism is, *The Church has not erred, because she is Infallible*, when it is impossible for me to know she is Infallible, till by examining her Doctrine by an Infallible Rule I know, that she has not erred.

And the truth is, it is well there can be no Infallible Judge; for if there were, it would suspend and silence the Reason and Judgment of all Mankind: and what a knowing Creature would Man be in Matters of Religion, when he must not reason, and must not judge? just as knowing as a Man can be without exercising any Reason and Judgment. And therefore not only the reason and nature of the thing proves, that there can be no Infallible Judge, but the design of Christ to advance Humane Nature to the utmost perfection of Reason and Understanding in this World, proves that he never intended there should be any: for to take away the exercise of Reason and private Judgment, is not the way to make Men wise and knowing Christians; and if Christ allows us to judge for ourselves, there can be no Infallible Judge, whose Office it shall be to judge for us all.

4th, To pretend the Scripture to be an obscure or imperfect Rule, is a direct Contradiction to the design of the Gospel to improve and perfect Knowledge: for if the Scripture be so obscure in the essential matters of Faith and Christian knowledge, that we cannot have any certainty what the true sense and interpretation of it is, without an Infallible Judge, then the Scriptures cannot improve our knowledge, because we cannot know what they are, we cannot understand their meaning, and therefore can learn nothing from them.

Yes you'll say, we may know their meaning, when they are expounded to us by an Infallible Judge: though the Scriptures are so obscure, that we cannot understand them without an Infallible Judge, yet we may certainly learn what the sense of Scripture is from such a Judge.

Now in answer to this, I observe, that though such an Infallible Judge should determine the sense of all obscure Texts of Scripture, (which neither the Pope nor Church of Rome have ever done) yet this would not be to understand the Scriptures, or to learn from the Scriptures, but only to rely on this Infallible Judge for the sense of Scri-

Scripture: To understand the Scriptures, is to be able to give a reason, why I expound Scripture to such a sense, as that the words signify so, that the circumstances of the place, and the context and coherence of the words require it; that the analogy of Faith, and the reason and nature of Things, will either justify such an Interpretation, or admit no other: and an Expositor, who can thus open our Understandings, and not only tell us what the sense of Scripture is, but make us see, that this is the true sense and interpretation of it, does indeed make us understand the Scripture. Thus Christ himself did, when he was risen from the Dead, *He opened their understandings, that they might understand the Scriptures*, 24 Luke 45. But to be told that this is the true sense of Scripture, and that we must believe this is the sense, though we can see no reason why it should be thus expounded, nay, though all the reason we have tells us, that it ought not to be thus expounded, no Man will say, that this is to understand the Scriptures, but to believe the Judge: No Man can learn any thing from a Book, which he does not and cannot understand; and if Men neither do nor can understand the Scriptures, it is certain, they can learn nothing from them: an Infallible Judge would teach as well without the Scriptures as with them, and indeed somewhat better, because then no Man could have a pretence to contradict him; and therefore if this be true, the Holy Scripture deserves all those contemptible Characters which the *Romanists* have given it; for it is so far from improving and perfecting our knowledge, that itself cannot be known, and therefore is good for nothing. So that the obscurity of the Scripture makes it wholly useless to the great Ends and Purposes of the Christian Religion, *viz.* to improve and perfect the knowledge of Mankind in the necessary and essential Doctrines of Faith, and therefore this can be no Gospel-Doctrine, because it makes the Gospel itself, considered as written, of no use.

Thus if the Scripture be an imperfect Rule, as the *Romanists* affirm, that it does not teach us the whole Mind and Will of God, but that we must learn even some necessary Doctrines of Faith from Unwritten Traditions, which no body has the keeping of but the Church of Rome: This I say contradicts the great design of the Gospel, which is to improve and perfect Knowledge; for an imperfect Rule of Faith is, I think, as bad as no Rule at all, because we can never trust it.

If you say, That though the Scripture in itself be an imperfect Rule, yet we have a perfect Rule, because the Defects of the Scripture are supplied by Unwritten Traditions; and therefore we have the whole Gospel, and all the Christian Knowledge delivered down

to

to us, either in the Written or Unwritten Rule. I answer,

1. If the Scriptures be an imperfect Rule, then all Christians have not a perfect Rule, because they have not the keeping of Unwritten Traditions, and know not what they are, and never can know what they are, till the Church is pleased to tell them; and it seems, it was a very great while, before the Church thought fit to do it. For suppose that all the new Articles of the Council of *Trent*, which are not contained in Scripture, were Unwritten Traditions, fifteen hundred Years was somewhat of the longest to have so considerable a part of the Rule of Faith concealed from the World; and who knows how much of it is concealed still, for the Church has not told us, that she has published all her Unwritten Traditions; there may be a Nest-egg left still, which in time may add twelve new Articles to the *Trent*-Creed, as that has done to the Apostles Creed.

So that if the Scripture be an imperfect Rule of Faith, the Church never had a perfect Rule, till the Council of *Trent*; for a Rule which is not known, is none at all, and no body can tell whether our Rule be perfect yet; whether some more Unwritten Traditions may not start up in the next Age to make our Faith more perfect, than the Council of *Trent* itself has made it. Now if the design of the Gospel was to instruct Men in all Divine Knowledge, can we think that our Saviour has given us such an imperfect Rule, as needs to be supplied by Unwritten Traditions in every Age? especially when we consider that some of the greatest Mysteries and most useful Doctrines of the Christian Religion, (if the Church of *Rome* be in the right) were not written, or so obscurely, that no body could find them in the Scriptures, till they were discovered by the help of Unwritten Traditions; such as the Supremacy of the Pope, the Infallibility of the Popes and General Councils, the Worship of Images, the Invocation of Saints, and the great Glory and Prerogatives of the Virgin *Mary*, the Doctrine of Purgatory, Indulgences, the Sacrament of Penance, &c. as necessary Doctrines as any that are recorded in Scripture, and the denial of which makes us all Hereticks and Schismaticks, as the Church of *Rome* says. Though thanks be to God, as far as appears, we are no greater Hereticks and Schismaticks, than the Apostles were, unless they are excused for not knowing these necessary Articles of Faith, and we are Hereticks for denying them, since the Church of *Rome* in the Council of *Trent* has decreed and published them.

2. These unwritten Traditions cannot supply the Defects of a written Rule, because they are of uncertain Authority, and therefore not the Objects, much less the Rule, of a certain Faith and Knowledge.

What

What is not written, but said to be delivered down from Age to Age by Oral Tradition, and kept so privately, that the Church of God never heard of it for several hundred Years, can never be proved but by Miracles, and they must be more credible Miracles too, than the School of the Eucharist, and the Legends of the Saints furnish us with; and yet I know of no better the Church of *Rome* has. It is impossible to prove, that a private Tradition cannot be corrupted; it is unreasonable to think that any thing which concerns the necessary Articles of Faith or Rules of Worship, should be a private and secret Tradition for several Ages. Miracles themselves cannot prove any Tradition which is contrary to the written Rule, and the Catholick Faith of Christians for several Ages, as several of the *Trent-Doctrines* are; nay, no Miracles can prove any new Article of Faith, which was never known before, without proving that Christ and his Apostles did not teach all things necessary to Salvation; which will go a great way to overthrow the truth and certainty of the Christian Faith: for Miracles themselves can never prove, that Christ and his Apostles taught that which the Christian Church never heard of before; which is either to prove that the whole World had forgot what they had been once taught, which I doubt is not much for the credit of Tradition, or that the Church for several Ages did not teach all that Christ taught, which is no great reason to rely on the Teachings of the Church; or to prove against matter of fact, that Christ and his Apostles taught that, which no body ever heard of, and I do not think a Miracle sufficient to prove that true, which every body knows to be false, or at least do not know it to be true, though they must have known it, if it had been true.

And does not every body now see, how improper Unwritten Traditions are, to supply the Defects and Imperfections of the Written Rule? for they can never make one Rule, because they are not of equal Authority. A Writing may be proved Authentick, an obscure unwritten Tradition cannot: and can any Man think, that Christ would have one half of his Gospel written, the other half unwritten, if he intended to perfect the knowledge of Christians: for they cannot have so perfect a knowledge, because they cannot have so great certainty, of the unwritten, as they have of the written Gospel. Writing is the most certain Way to perpetuate Knowledge, and if Christ intended, that his Church in all Ages should have a perfect Rule of Faith, we must acknowledge the perfection of the written Rule. The truth is, I cannot but admire the great artifice of the Church of *Rome*, in preaching up the Obscurity and Imperfection of the Scriptures,

ptures, for she has hereby put it into her own power, to make Christian Religion, what she pleases; for if the Scriptures be obscure, and she alone can infallibly interpret them; if the Scriptures be imperfect, and she alone can supply their Defects by Unwritten Traditions, it is plain, that Christian Religion must be, what she says it is, and it shall be, what her interest requires it to be. But whether this be consistent with our Saviour's design in publishing the Gospel, or whether it be the best way of improving the Knowledge of Mankind, let any impartial Man judge.

sly, An Implicit Faith, or believing as the Church believes, without knowing what it is we believe, can be no Gospel-Doctrine, because this to be sure cannot be for the improvement of Knowledge. Some of the *Roman* Doctors think it sufficient, that a Man believes as the Church believes, without an explicate knowledge of any thing they believe; but the general Opinion is, That a Man must have an explicate belief of the *Apostles Creed*, but as for every thing else it suffices, if he believes as the Church believes, without knowing, what the Faith of the Church is; that is, it is not necessary Men should so much as know, what the new Articles of the *Trent-Faith* are, if they believe the *Apostles Creed*, and resign up their Faith implicitly to the Church.

Now this is a plain Confession, that all the Doctrines in dispute between Us and the Church of *Rome*, are of no use, much less necessary to Salvation; for if they were, they would be as necessary to be known, and explicitly believed, as the *Apostles Creed*: and I cannot imagine, why we Hereticks, who believe the *Apostles Creed*, and understand it as orthodoxly as they, may not be saved without believing the new *Trent Creed*; for if we need not know what it is, there seems to be no need of believing it; for I always thought, that no Man can, and therefore to be sure no Man need, believe, what he does not know. So that it seems, we know and believe all things, the explicate knowledge, and belief of which, by their own Confession, is necessary to Salvation, except that one single Point of the Infallibility of the Church of *Rome*: believe but that, and ye need believe or know nothing more but the *Apostles Creed*, and yet go to Heaven as a good *Catholic*: which makes an implicit Faith in the Church of *Rome*, as necessary as Faith in Christ is.

But if the intent of the Gospel was to improve our Knowledge, then Christ never taught an implicit Faith, for that does not improve Knowledge: and if the Faith of the Church of *Rome*, excepting the *Apostles Creed*, which is the common Faith of all Christians, need not be known, then they are no Gospel-Doctrine, much

less necessary Articles of Faith, for Christ taught nothing, but what he would have known; and tho' the knowledge of all things, which Christ taught, is not equally necessary to Salvation, yet it tends to the perfecting our knowledge, and Christ taught nothing which a Man need not know; which I think is a reproach to meaner Masters, and much more to the eternal and incarnate Wisdom.

II. The improvement and perfection of Humane Nature consists in true Holiness and Vertue, in a Likeness and Conformity to God, and a Participation of the Divine Nature: and this is the great end of the Gospel to advance us to as perfect Holiness as is attainable in this Life: Christ indeed has made Expiation for our Sins by his own Blood, but then this very Blood of Atonement does not only expiate the guilt of Sin, but purges the Conscience from dead Works, that we may serve the living God: for no Sacrifice, not of the Son of God himself, can reconcile an impenitent and unreformed Sinner to God; that is, can move God to love a Sinner, who still loves and continues in his Sins; which an infinitely Holy and Pure Being cannot do: Indeed the Expiation of Sin is but one part of the Work of our Redemption; for a Sinner cannot be saved, that is, cannot be advanced to immortal Life in the Kingdom of Heaven, without being born again, without being renewed and sanctified by the Holy Spirit, after the Image and Likeness of God. For this new Nature is the only Principle of a new immortal Life in us; an earthly sensual Mind is no more capable of living in Heaven, than an earthly mortal Body: In both senses *flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, neither can corruption inherit incorruption.*

The Church of Rome indeed has taken great care about the first of these, and has found out more ways of expiating Sin, and making satisfaction for it, than the Gospel ever taught us; whether they are so effectual to this purpose, let those look to it, who trust in them: but there is not that care taken to inculcate the necessity of internal holiness and purity of Mind, and one would easily guess there can be no great need of it in that Church, which has so many easy ways of expiating Sin.

The true Character of Gospel-Doctrine is, a Doctrine according to Godliness, the principal design of which is to promote true Goodness; all the Articles of the Christian Faith tend to this end, to lay great and irresistible Obligations on us to abstain from every Sin, and to exercise ourselves in every thing that is good, as we have ability and opportunity to do it: and therefore all Doctrines which secretly under-

undermine a good Life, and make it unnecessary for Men to be truly and sincerely Vertuous, can be no Gospel-Doctrines. That there are such Doctrines in the Church of *Rome*, has been abundantly proved by the late Learned and Reverend Bishop *Taylor* in his *Dissuasive from Popery*; which is so very useful a Book, that I had rather direct my Readers to it, than transcribe out of it: My design leads me to another method; for if I can prove that the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of *Rome* naturally tend to evacuate the force of the Gospel itself, to make Men good and holy; every one will easily see that that can be no Gospel Faith and Worship, which sets aside the Gospel-itself.

The whole Doctrine of the Gospel either consists of the Rules of Holiness, or of the Motives and Instruments of it; for the Articles of the Christian Faith are all of them so many Motives to a good Life: let us then consider how the Faith and Worship of the Church of *Rome* has made void the Gospel of our Saviour, as the *Pharisees* made void the Law of *Moses* by their Traditions.

1. Let us begin then with the Gospel-Rules of Holiness: It would be an endless thing here to take notice of the loose Determinations of their famed and approved *Casuits*, of their Doctrine of Probable Opinions, of the Direction of the Intention, by which means the very Laws and Boundaries of Virtue and Vice are in a great measure quite altered; and it may be this would only make work for the *Representer*, and furnish out a fourth Part of the *Papist* *Misrepresented*, if we venture to tell the World what has been the avowed Doctrines of their great Divines and *Casuits*. But whether such Definitions be the Doctrine of their Church or not, I am sure they are equally mischievous, if they be the Doctrines of their Confessors who have the immediate Direction of Mens Conscience. Those who have a mind to be satisfied in this matter, may find enough of it in the *Provincial Letters*, the *Jesuits Morals*, and Bishop *Taylor's Dissuasive*. It sufficiently answers my present design to take notice of some few plain things, which will admit of no dispute.

I have already shewn what a great value the Church of *Rome* sets upon an external Righteousness, which is much more meritorious than a real and substantial Piety and Virtue. Now let any Man judge whether this be not apt to corrupt Mens Notions of what is good; to persuade them that such external Observances are much more pleasing to God, and therefore certainly much better in themselves, than true Gospel-Obedience, than Moral and Evangelical Vertues; for that which will merit of God the Pardon of

the greatest Immoralities, and a great Reward, that which supplies the want of true Vertue, which compensates for Sin, and makes Men great Saints, must needs be more pleasing to God, than Vertue itself is: and if Men can believe this, all the Laws of Holiness signifie nothing, but to let Men know, when they break them, that they may make Satisfaction by some meritorious Superstitions.

Thus the Doctrine of Venial Sins, which are hardly any Sins at all, to be sure how numerous soever they are, or how frequently soever repeated, cannot deserve eternal Punishments, is apt to give Men very slight thoughts of very great Evils: For very great Evils may come under the notion of Venial Sins, when they are the effects of Passion and Surprize, and the like. Indeed this very Doctrine of Venial Sins is so perplexed and undermined, that the Priest and the Penitent may serve themselves of it to good purpose: I am sure this Distinction is apt to make Men careless of what they think little Faults, which are generally the seeds and dispositions to much greater; such as the sudden eruptions of Passion, some wanton Thoughts, an *indecorum* and undecency in Words and Actions, and what Men will please to call little Venial Sins, for there is no certain Rule to know them by: so that while this Distinction lasts, Men have an excuse at hand for a great many Sins, which they need take no care of; they are not obliged to aim at those Perfections of Vertue, which the Gospel requires; if they keep clear of Mortal Sins, they are safe, and that Men may do, without any great attainments in Vertue; which does not look very like a Gospel-Doctrine, which gives us such admirable Laws, which requires such great circumspection in our Lives, such a command over our Passions, such an inoffensiveness in our Words and Actions, as no Institution in the World ever did before. Whatever corrupt Mens Notions of Good and Evil, as External Superstitions, and the Distinction between Venial and Mortal Sins is apt to do, is a contradiction to the design of the Gospel, to give us the plain Rules and Precepts of a perfect Vertue.

Secondly, Let us consider some of the principal Motives of the Gospel to a Holy Life, and see, whether the Church of Rome does not evacuate them also, and destroy their force and power.

Now, 1. The Fundamental Motive of all, is the absolute necessity of a Holy Life; that *without holiness no man shall see GOD*; for no other Argument has any necessary force without this. But the absolute

absolute necessity of a Holy Life to please God, and to go to Heaven, is many ways overthrown by the Church of *Rome*, and nothing would more effectually overthrow the Church of *Rome*, than to re-establish this Doctrine of the absolute necessity of a good Life. For were Men once convinced of this, that there is no way to get to Heaven, but by being truly and sincerely Good; they would keep their Money in their Pockets, and not sling it so lavishly away upon Indulgencies, or Masses; they would stay at home, and not tire themselves with fruitless Pilgrimages, and prodigal Offerings at the Shrines of some powerful Saints, all external, troublesome and costly Superstitions would fall into contempt; good Men would feel, that they need them not, and if bad Men were convinced, that they would do them no good, there were an end of them, for the only use of them, is to excuse Men from the necessity of being good.

But this is most evident in their Doctrine about the Sacrament of Penance, that bare Contrition with the Absolution of the Priest, puts a Man into a state of Salvation; I do not lay it upon Attrition, which is somewhat less than Contrition, though the Council of *Trent*, if I can understand plain words, makes that sufficient with the Absolution of the Priest; but because some Men will unreasonably wrangle about this, I shall insist only on what is acknowledged by themselves, that Contrition, which is only a sorrow for Sin, if we confess our Sins to a Priest, and receive Absolution, puts us into a state of Grace: now Contrition, or Sorrow for Sin, is not a Holy Life, and therefore this Doctrine overthrows the necessity of a Holy Life, because Men may be saved by the Sacrament of Penance without it, and then I know no necessity there is of mortifying their Lusts: for if they sin again, it is only repeating the same Remedy, confessing their Sins; and being sorry for them, and receiving Absolution, and they are restored to the Favour of God, and to a state of Salvation again. Nay, some of their Casuists tell us, that God has not commanded Men to repent, but only at the time of Death, and then Contrition with Absolution will secure their Salvation, after a whole life spent in Wickedness, without any other good Action, but only Sorrow for Sin: and if Men are not bound by the Laws of God so much as to be contrite for their Sins, till they find themselves dying, and incapable of doing any good, all Men must grant, that a Holy Life is not necessary to Salvation.

2. More.

2. More particularly : The love of God in giving his own Son to die for us, and the love of Christ in giving himself for us, are great Gospel-Motives to Obedience and a Holy Life ; but these can only work upon ingenuous Minds, who have already in some measure conquered the love of Sin ; for where the love of Sin prevails, it is too powerful for the love of God ; but the holiness and purity and inflexible justice of the Divine Nature is a very good argument, because it enforces the necessity of a Holy Life ; for a Holy God cannot be reconciled to wicked Men ; will not forgive our Sins, unless we repent of them, and reform them : which must engage all Men, who hope for Pardon and Forgiveness from God, to forsake their Sins, and reform their Lives : but the force of this Argument is lost in the Church of *Rome* by the judicial Absolution of the Priest ; for they see daily the Priest does absolve them without forsaking their Sins, and God must confirm the sentence of his Ministers, and therefore they are absolved, and need not fear, that God will not absolve them, when the Priest has ; which must either destroy all sense of God's essential Holiness and Purity, and persuade them, that God can be reconciled to Sinners, while they continue in their Sins, or else, they must believe, that God has given power to his Priests, to absolve those, whom he could not have absolved himself : To be sure it is in vain to tell Men, that God will not forgive Sinners, while they continue in their Sins, if they believe the judicial Authority of the Priest to forgive Sins ; for they every day absolve Men, who do not forsake their Sins, and if their Absolution be good, God must forgive them too ; and thus the holiness and inflexible justice of God loses its force upon good Catholics to reform their Lives ; and therefore were there no other arguments against it, it is not likely that the judicial Absolution of the Priest, as it is taught and practised in the Church of *Rome*, should be a Gospel-Doctrine.

3. The Death and Sacrifice of Christ is another Gospel-Motive to Holiness of Life ; not only because he has now bought us with his own Blood, and therefore we must no longer live unto ourselves, but to him, who died for us ; but because his Blood is the Blood of the Covenant, and the efficacy of his Sacrifice extends no farther than the Gospel-Covenant, which *teaches us to deny all ungodliness and worldly lusts, and to live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world* : That is, no Man can be saved by the Blood of Christ, but those who obey the Gospel, which obliges all Men, who hope to be saved by Christ, to the practise of an universal Righteousness.

This

This the Church of *Rome* seems very sensible of, that none but sincere Penitents, and truly good Men can be saved by the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross; which gives no hope to Sinners, who do not repent of their Sins and amend their Lives; and therefore she has found out a great many other ways of expiating Sin, which give more comfort to Sinners. The Sacrifice of the Mass has a distinct Vertue and Merit from the Sacrifice upon the Cross; it is a propitiatory Sacrifice for the Living and the Dead, to expiate especially the Sins of those, for whom it is particularly offered; and thus those Sins which are not expiated by the Death of Christ upon the Cross, are expiated by the Sacrifice of the Mass, and that by the bear *opus operum*, by the offering this Sacrifice of the Mass itself, without any good motion in the Person for whom it is offered; and thus the Sacrifice of the Mass destroys the Vertue of Christ's Sacrifice upon the Cross, to oblige Men to Holiness of Life; for though none but sincere and reformed Penitents are pardoned by the Sacrifice of the Cross, the Sacrifice of the Mass will expiate the Sins of unreformed Sinners, and then there is no need to reform our Lives. Thus I am sure all Men understand it, or they would never put their confidence in the Mass-Sacrifice; for if it does no more for us than Christ's Death upon the Cross, it might be spared, for it gives no new comforts to impenitent Sinners.

They are very sensible, that Holiness of Life is necessary to intitle us to the Pardon and Forgiveness purchased by the Death of Christ; but then the Sacrifice of the Mass, Humane Penances, and Satisfactions, and Merits, and Indulgences, seem on purpose contrived to supply the place of Holiness of Life; for no body can imagine else what they are good for. Christ has by his Death upon the Cross, made a perfect Atonement for the Sins of all true penitent and reformed Sinners; and therefore a true Penitent, who according to the terms of the Gospel, *denies all ungodliness and worldly lusts, and lives soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world*, needs no Expiation but the Death of Christ: Will they deny this? by no means! They grant, that all our Sins are done away in Baptism, merely by the application of Christ's Death and Passion to us; and therefore the Death of Christ is a complete and perfect Satisfaction for all Sin, or else Baptism, which derives its whole vertue from the Death of Christ, could not wash away all Sin: What use can there be then of the new propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass, of Humane Satisfactions, and Merits, and Indulgences? Truly none but this, that when our Sins are expiated by the Death of Christ, and the Pardon

don

don of all our Sins applied to us in Baptism, the Gospel exacts a Holy Life from us, and therefore Men forfeit the Baptismal Pardon of their Sins by the Blood of Christ, unless they either live very Holy Lives, or make some other Satisfaction for their not doing so: And for this purpose the Sacrifice of the Mass, Humane Penances, and Satisfactions serve. It will not be unuseful, nor unpleasant to draw a short Scheme of this whole Matter, which will explain this great Mystery, and make it intelligible, which now appears to be nothing but Nonfence and Confusion:

Christ then has made a perfect Atonement and Expiation for Sin; this is applied to us at Baptism, wherein all our Sins are forgiven; and while we continue in this state of Grace, we cannot be eternally Damned, though we may be punished for our Sins, both in this World and Purgatory. But every mortal Sin puts us out of the state of Grace, which we were in by Baptism, and till we be restored to the state of Grace again, we must be eternally damned, because we have no right to the Sacrifice and Expiation of Christ's Death: the only way in the Church of *Rome*, to restore us to this state of Grace, is by the Sacrament of Penance, and the Absolution of the Priest, which restores us to the same state which Baptism at first put us into, and therefore very well deserves to be thought a Sacrament: And thus we recover our interest in the Merits of Christ's Death, and therefore cannot be eternally damned for our Sins; but still it is our Duty to live well, for the Death of Christ does not excuse us from Holiness of Life, which is the Condition of the Gospel; and therefore if we are in a state of Grace, and thereby secured from eternal Damnation, yet if we live in Sin we must be punished for it, unless we can find some other Expiation for Sin, than the Death of Christ upon the Cross, which still leaves us under the obligations of a Holy Life, and therefore cannot make such an Expiation for Sin, as shall serve instead of a Holy Life: Now here comes in the Sacrifice of the Mass, Humane Penance, Satisfactions, Indulgences;

For the Sacrifice of the Mass, as I observed before, does not serve the same end, that the Sacrifice of the Cross does: the Sacrifice of the Mass is a Propitiatory Sacrifice for the Living and the Dead; But what Sins is it a Propitiation for? For such Sins for which Men are to satisfy themselves; that is, for all Sins the eternal Punishment of which is remitted for the Sacrifice of the Cross. This is evident from their making the Sacrifice of the Mass a Propitiatory Sacrifice for the Dead; that is, for the Souls in Purgatory, who suffer there the temporal Punishments of Sin, when the eternal Punishment is forgiven:

given: the Souls in Hell are capable of no Expiation, and therefore an Expiatory Sacrifice for the Dead, can be only for the Souls in Purgatory, and that is for the temporal Punishment of Sin, for which the Sacrifice of the Cross is no Expiation; and the Mass is in no other sense made a Sacrifice for the Living than for the Dead; and therefore is not to expiate the eternal, but the temporal Punishments of Sin, as appears from hence, that the saying Masses, or hearing Masses, or purchasing Masses, is reckoned among those Penances Men must do for the Expiation of their Sins, and yet they can, by all they do, only expiate for the temporal Punishment of Sin; and therefore Masses for the Living are only for the Expiation of those temporal Punishments of Sin, for which the Sacrifice of the Cross made no Expiation. And I shall be so civil at present, as not to inquire, how the Sacrifice of the Cross, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, which are the very same Sacrifice of the Natural Body and Blood of Christ, come to serve such very different ends: that when Christ was sacrificed upon the Cross, he expiated only for the eternal Punishment of Sin; when sacrificed in the Mass, only for the temporal. I need add nothing to prove, that Humane Penances, Satisfactions, Merits, Indulgences, are only to expiate temporal Punishment of Sin, because it is universally acknowledged. Now if these temporal Punishments be only in lieu of Holiness and Obedience which the Gospel requires to intitle us to the Expiation of Christ's Death upon the Cross, as I have already shewn; then it is evident to a demonstration, that the Church of Rome has overthrown the Death and Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, consider'd as an argument of a Holy Life, by setting up the Sacrifice of the Mass, Humane Penances, Satisfactions, Merits, Indulgences, instead of the Gospel-Terms of Obedience and Holiness of Life.

4. The Intercession of Christ for us, at the right hand of God, is another powerful Motive to Holiness of Life: It gives all the encouragement to true penitent Sinners, that can be desired; For if any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father Jesus Christ the righteous, who is also a propitiation for our sins. ^{1 Joh. 2.2.} But then Christ mediates only in virtue of his Blood, that is, only upon the terms and conditions of the Covenant of Grace which was sealed by his Blood; that is, he mediates and intercedes only for true penitent Sinners; which obliges us, as we hope to be heard by God, when we pray in the Name of Christ, truly and heartily to repent of all our Sins, and to live a new Life.

K

! This

This the Church of *Rome* also seems very sensible of, that Christ of his own accord will not intercede for impenitent and unreformed Sinners ; that he who is the great Example and the great Preacher of Righteousness, will not espouse the Cause of incorrigible Sinners, who are very desirous of Pardon, but hate to be reformed ; and therefore they seem to think it as hopeless a thing to go immediately to a Holy Jesus, as to appear before the Tribunal of a Just and Righteous God, without a powerful Advocate.

For this reason they have found out a great many other Advocates and Mediators, a great deal more pitiful and compassionate than Christ is, who by their interest in him, or their great favour with God, may obtain that Pardon which otherwise they could not hope for ; such as the *Virgin Mary*, who is the Mother of Christ, and therefore, as they presume, has as great interest in, and authority over him, as a Mother has over her Son ; besides those vast numbers of meritorious Saints, whose Intercessions cannot but prevail for those Sinners whose Cause they undertake.

And that this is the true reason of their Addresses to Saints and the *Virgin Mary*, though they will not speak out, is evident to any considering Man : For will they say, that Christ, who became Man for us, who suffered and died for us, who was in all things tempted like as we are, yet without Sin ; who did and suffered all this on purpose that he might be a merciful and compassionate High-Priest, and might give us the highest assurance of his tenderness and compassion for us. I say, can they suspect that such a High-Priest will not undertake to plead our Cause, if we be such as according to the Terms of the Gospel, it is his Office to intercede for ? No Christian dare say this, which is such a reproach to our common Saviour, who hath bought us with his own Blood ; and therefore no Christian who thinks himself within the reach and compass of Christ's Intercession, can need or desire any other Advocate : but those who are conscious to themselves of so much Wickedness, that they cannot hope the Holy Jesus will intercede for them for their own sakes, have reason to procure some other Favourites to intercede for them with their Intercessor ; and to countenance the matter, they must recommend it to the practice of all Christians, and more than so, make it Heresie to deny it. There is but one Argument I know of against this, that any Man should be so stupid as to think that the Intercession of the *Virgin Mary*, or the most powerful Saints, can prevail with our Saviour to do that, which according to the Laws of his own Mediation, they know he cannot and will not do : and this I confess I cannot

not answer, but yet so it is. And thus the Intercession of Christ is made a very ineffectual Argument to make Men good; for though Christ will intercede for none but true Penitents, the Church of Rome has a great many other Advocates that will, or at least she persuades People that they will.

5. Another great Gospel-Motive to a Holy Life, is the hope of Heaven, and the fear of Hell. As for the hope of Heaven, that is no otherwise a Motive to Holiness of Life, but upon a supposition of the necessity of Holiness, that *without holiness no man shall see God*; but this you have already heard, is overthrown by the Church of Rome: and if Men may go to Heaven without Holiness, I know no need of it for that purpose in this World.

But Hell is a very terrible thing, to be condemned to endless and eternal Torments with the Devil and his Angels; but then the Doctrine of Purgatory does mightily abate and take off this terror: for though Purgatory be a terrible place too, not cooler than Hell itself, yet it is not eternal; and Men, who are mightily in love with their Sins, will venture temporal Punishments, though somewhat of the longest, to enjoy their present Satisfaction: especially considering how many easie ways there are for rich Men to get out of Purgatory; those who have Money enough to buy Indulgences while they live, and Masses for their Souls when they die, need not lie long there, if the Priests are not out in their reckoning: and yet it is so easie a thing for a good Catholick to get into Purgatory; especially if he take care frequently to Confess himself, and receive Absolution, or do not die so suddenly as to be surprized in any mortal Sin, that Hell seems to be very little thought of, or feared in the Church of Rome. Now I desire no better Argument, that all these are not Gospel-Doctrines, than that they destroy the force of all those Arguments the Gospel uses to make Men good; that is, they are a direct Contradiction to the Gospel of Christ.

6. I shall name but one Motive more, and that is the Examples of good Men; *To be followers of them, who through faith and patience inherit the promises*; that being compassed with such a cloud of witnesses, we should lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and run with patience the race which is set before us. Now this is a powerful Argument, because they were Men as we are, subject to the same temptations and infirmities; and therefore their Examples prove, that Holiness is a practicable thing; that it is possible for Men to conquer all the difficulties of Religion, and all the temptations in this Life; and many times in them we see the visible Re-

12 Heb. 1.

wards of Vertue in great peace of Mind, great assurances of the Divine Favour, great supports under all Adversities, and such a triumphant Death, as is a blessed presage of a glorious Resurrection.

But now in the Church of *Rome*, if there be any great and meritorious Saints, as they call them, their extraordinary Vertues are not so much for Imitation as for a Stock of Merits. The more Saints they have, the less reason other Men have to be Saints, if they have no mind to it, because there is a greater treasury of Merits in the Church to relieve those who have none of their own. The extraordinary Devotion of their Monasteries and Nunneries, (for so they would persuade the World, that there is nothing but Devotion there) is not for Imitation, and it is unreasonable it should, because no body sees it; and it is impossible to imitate that reclusive Life, without turning the whole World into a Monastery: but these Religious Societies furnish the Church with a stock of Merits, out of which she grants Indulgences to those, who are not very religious; and it is plain, that if one Man can merit for twenty, there is no need, there should be above one in twenty good. Herein indeed the Members of the Church of *Rome*, have the advantage of all other Churches, (especially if they enter themselves into any Religious Confraternity, to partake in the Merits of the Society) that others can merit for them; and then if we can share in the Merits of the Saints, we need not imitate them: a Church which has Saints to merit for them on Earth, and to intercede for them in Heaven, if she can but maintain and propagate a Race of such meriting Saints, (which is taken care of in the Institution and Encouragement of Monastick Orders and Fraternities) may be very indulgent to the rest of her Members, who do not like meriting themselves. So that the principal Motives of the Gospel to Holy Life, as appears in these Six Particulars, lose their force and efficacy in the Church of *Rome*, and certainly those cannot be Gospel-Doctrines, which destroy the great end of the Gospel to make Men good.

34, Nor do the Gospel means and Instruments of Holiness and Vertue escape better in the Church of *Rome*: as will appear in a very few words.

Reading and Meditating on the Holy Scriptures, is one excellent means of Grace, not only as it informs us of our Duty, but as it keeps a constant warm sense of it upon our Minds, which nothing can so effectually do, as a daily reading of the Scripture, which strikes the mind with a more sacred Authority, than any Humane Discourses can do: but this is denied to the People of the Church of *Rome*, who

who are not allowed to read the Scriptures in the Vulgar Tongue, for fear of Heresie, which, it seems, is more plain and obvious in the Scripture than Catholick Doctrines: but they should also have considered, whether the danger of Heresie or Sin be the greater; whether an Orthodox Faith or a good Life be more valuable; and if denying the People the use of the Bible be the way to keep them Orthodox, I am sure it is not the way to make them good; True Piety will lose more by this, than the Faith will get by it.

Thus constant and fervent Prayer, besides that supernatural grace and assistance it obtains for us, is an excellent moral Instrument of Holiness: for when Men confess their Sins to God with shame and sorrow, when with inflamed Devotions, they beg the assistances of the Divine Grace, when their Souls are every day possessed with such a great sense, awe, and reverence for God, as he must have, who prays devoutly to him every day; I say, it is impossible such Men should easily return to those Sins, which they have so lately confessed, with such shame and confusion and bitter remorse; that those who so importunately beg the assistance of the Divine Grace, should not use their best endeavours to resist Temptations, and to improve in Grace and Vertue, which is a prophane Mockery of God, to beg his assistance, that he will work in us, and with us, when we will not work: that those who have a constant sense and reverence of God, should do such things, as argue, that Men have no fear of God before their eyes.

But this is all lost in the Church of *Rome*, where Men are taught to pray they know not what, and when Men do not understand their Prayers, it is certain such Prayers cannot affect their minds, what other good soever *Latine* Prayers may do them; and thus one of the most powerful Instruments of Piety and Vertue is quite spoiled by Prayers in an unknown Tongue, which can no more improve their Vertue than their Knowledge.

Sorrow for Sin is an excellent Instrument of true Repentance, as that signifies the reformation of our Lives; for the natural effect of Sorrow is, not to do that again, which we are sorry for doing; but in the Church of *Rome*, this contrition, or sorrow for Sin, serves only to qualifie Men for Absolution, and that puts them into a state of Grace, and then they may expiate their Sins by Penances, but are under no necessity of forsaking them.

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, besides those supernatural Conveyances of Grace, which are annexed to it, by our Saviour's Institution, is a great Moral Instrument of Holiness; it representing
to.

to us the Love of our crucified Lord, the Merit and Desert of Sin, the Vertue of his Sacrifice to expiate our Sins, and to purge our Consciences from dead Works, and requiring the exercise of a great many Vertues; an abhorrence and detestation of our Sins, great and ardent Passions of Love and Devotion, firm Resolutions of Living to him, who Died for us, Forgiveness of Enemies, and an Universal Love and Charity to all Men, especially to the Members of the same Body with us; but in the Church of *Rome* this admirable Sacrament is turned into a dumb Show, which no body can be edified with, or into a Sacrifice for the Living and the Dead, which expiates Sin, and serves us instead of a Holy Life, as I observed above.

External Mortifications, and Severities to the Body, Fastings, Watchings, hard Lodgings, &c. are very useful Instruments of Vertue, when they are intended to subdue the Flesh to the Spirit, and to wean our Minds from Sensual Enjoyments; but when they are intended to satisfy for our Sins, not to kill them; to punish ourselves for our Sins, that we may commit them more securely again, this is not a means to break vicious Habits, and to conquer the love of Sin, but only to conquer the fear of committing it.

This is enough to shew, how far *Popery* is from promoting the great Design of the Gospel to improve and perfect Humane Nature and Holiness, and were there no other Argument against it, this were sufficient to me to prove, That it cannot be the Religion of the Gospel of Christ.

F I N I S.

Books Published by the Reverend Dr. *Sherlock*,
and Printed for *William Rogers*.

AN *Answer to a Discourse entituled, Papists Protesting against Protestant Popery; being a Vindication of Papists not Misrepresented by Protestants, and containing a particular Examination of Monsr. de Meaux, late Bishop of Condom, his Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, in the Articles of Invocation of Saints, Worship of Images, occasioned by that Discourse. Quarto. Second Edition.*

An Answer to the Amicable Accommodation of the Differences between the Representer and the Answerer. Quarto.

A Sermon preached at the Funeral of the Reverend Benj. Calamy, D. D. and late Minister of St. Lawrence Jury, London, Jan. 7. 1685. Quarto.

A Vindication of some Protestant Principles of Church Unity and Catholic Communion, from the Charge of Agreement with the Church of Rome; In Answer to a late Pamphlet entituled, An Agreement between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, evinced from the Concetration of some of her Sons, with their Brethren the Dissenters. Quarto. Second Edition.

A Preservative against Popery: being some plain Directions to Unlearned Protestants, how to Dispute with Romish Priests. First Part. Quarto. Fifth Edition.

A Second Part of the Preservative against Popery, shewing how contrary Popery is to the true Ends of the Christian Religion, suited for the Instructions of Unlearned Protestants. Quarto. Third Edition.

A Vindication of both Parts of the Preservative against Popery, in Answer to the Cavils of Lewis Sabran, Jesuit. Quarto.

A Discourse concerning the Nature, Unity, and Communion of the Catholic Church, wherein most of the Controversies relating to the Church, are briefly and plainly Stated. First Part. Quarto.

A Sermon preached before the Right Honorable the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of the City of London, at Guild-Hall Chappel, on Sunday November the 4th, 1688. Quarto.

A Practical Discourse concerning Death. Octavo. Fifth Edition.

A Vindication of the Doctrine of the Holy and Ever Blessed Trinity, and the Incarnation of the Son of God, occasioned by the brief Notes on the Creed of St. Athanasius, and the brief History of the Unitarians or Socinians, and containing an Answer to both. Quarto. Second Edition.

The Case of the Allegiance due to Sovereign Powers, Stated and Resolved, according to Scripture and Reason, and the Principles of the Church of England, with a more particular Respect to the Oath, lately enjoined, of Allegiance to their present Majesties, K. William and Q. Mary. Quarto. Seventh Edition.

A Vindication of the Case of Allegiance due to Sovereign Powers, in reply to an Answer to a late Pamphlet, intituled, Obedience and Submission to the Present Government, demonstrated from Bishop Overal's Convocation-Book; with a Postscript in Answer to Dr. Sherlock's Case of Allegiance, &c.

These by William Sherlock, D. D. Master of the Temple.

Of the Wisdom and Goodness of Providence. Two Sermons preached before the Queen at White-Hall, on August 17th and 24th, 1690. By John Moore, D. D. Rector of St. Andrew's Holborn, and Chaplain in Ordinary to Their Majesties. Quarto.

Religion and Loyalty Inseparable. A Sermon preached at the Assizes held at Nottingham, September the 5th, 1690. By Clement Ellis, M. A. Rector of Kirby, in the County of Nottingham.

